



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>

HARVARD DIVINITY SCHOOL
ANDOVER-HARVARD THEOLOGICAL
LIBRARY



From the collection
of the
UNIVERSALIST HISTORICAL
SOCIETY



THE FUTURE LIFE:

OR,

I M M O R T A L I T Y,

AS

REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

BY JEROME HARRIS.

PORTLAND:
S. H. COLESWORTHY.

1849.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1849,
By JEROME HARRIS,
In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of Maine.

~~~~~  
PRINTED BY C. W. PENNELL & CO.,  
65 & 69, Exchange Street, Portland.  
~~~~~

BT
931
.H3

P R E F A C E

THE subject of the following pages is fraught with the most thrilling interest; and is acknowledged by all, whether believer or unbeliever, to be of the most solemn importance, worthy of the profoundest attention of every individual; and involving, as it does, the destiny of man and the hope of immortality, it requires and has commanded the minds and pens of the ablest philosophers and most learned divines. Yet, after all, much labor is required to extract the true from among the false, and to place it in a tangible form before the popular mind. Though in most cases it requires great minds to discover truth, yet after it has been discovered, minds, claiming but few of the elements of greatness, may perhaps do the world as great a service, by gathering it up and arranging it in a popular form, as they who first discovered it.

It is usual, however, for those who write or prepare books for publication, feeling that they have advanced but little that was unknown to the public before, to offer apologies for presenting the world with their speculations; but the reason I am disposed to give for publishing my views of the Future Life is, that such a work is needed. The experience of every preacher tells him that something more than has been given is demanded, to satisfy a great many minds on that subject; and by supplying this demand I hope to do something for truth and human happiness. Much, indeed, has been written, but no one book

contains what seems to be required. I have gathered from all within my search what would subserve my purpose, and have employed it as best I could.

During the period of my ministry, I have been questioned more in relation to the Resurrection of the dead, than any other subject within the whole range of theology; and nothing has been more difficult to answer, than some of the questions which have been put to me. At first I was greatly perplexed and embarrassed. I sought assistance from others, and received but little. But, believing that there was truth in the Bible, on the subject, I went to work in good earnest to find it, and in due time I obtained that which was satisfactory to my own mind. I presented it to others and it satisfied them. And as the church and society with which I am now connected, were somewhat disturbed by conflicting sentiments on the Doctrine of the Resurrection of the dead, when I commenced my labors with them, I collected a variety of materials, with the determination to digest and arrange them, and at some future day, publish them in the form of a book. But the cares and duties of a clergyman, settled over a society scattered over considerable territory, and other labors which may not now be mentioned, have prevented the accomplishment of the work according to the first design. I have not been able to digest and dispose of all the materials collected as I could wish; but as there is really a great demand for a work on the Resurrection of the dead, and as my views seem to meet the wants of those who have examined them, I have concluded to publish them without farther delay.

I have selected from the Universalist Quarterly, and from Professor Bush's work on the Resurrection, the matter which

composes chapters III., V. and VI. of this book. The articles in the Quarterly, from which this matter was taken, were originally written by Dr. Ballou and Rev. R. O. Williams. The truths of these articles are worthy of a wider circulation than they could possibly have as first published, and I know not as they could be better presented were they clothed in different language.

In the following pages, the different theories of the Resurrection of the dead, which have been broached, are carefully considered ; the passages of Scripture, which have been usually adduced as proof of a bodily and simultaneous resurrection, are examined and explained ; and I have aimed to render every sentence perspicuous and level to the understanding of the attentive reader. I have not attempted to make any rhetorical displays ; and, as far as possible, have avoided referring to the Greek language, and using foreign terms and phrases. I am fully confident that the leading sentiments advanced in this work are true ; yet, doubtless, there are many errors in style and arrangement. But if it shall be instrumental in dispelling darkness, even from a few minds, and in giving them clear views of the Future Life, I shall feel that some good has been done, and be satisfied.



CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

DEATH THE KING OF TERRORS.

Our feelings in relation to it — Death the king of terrors — The pain of dying not the reason why it is thus called — The thought of annihilation terrible — A strong love of life makes men strive to banish the thoughts of death from their minds — Very difficult to impress them with its reality — Love of life a proof of immortality — But what saith the Bible — To that the appeal must be made — The language of dying believers — To learn all the sentiments of the Bible not a light task. p. 13

CHAPTER II.

EXAMINATION OF THE EMANATION THEORY.

The souls of men are emanations from God — They enter human bodies pure, and are never contaminated by sin — The body is the source of iniquity — When the body dies, the spirit returns to God and is absorbed in Him — If this theory be true, then is annihilation true also — Sin has no existence in fact — Christ no Saviour — Death all the Saviour men need — The Bible does not teach that the spirit of man is an emanation from God — It was created as were the heavens and the earth — Neither does the Bible teach that it will be finally submerged in the bosom of the Eternal Spirit — The soul has a higher destiny than this. p. 27

CHAPTER III.

FLESH, BLOOD, &c., AS THE CAUSE OF SIN.

“Flesh and blood” sometimes denote men living in this world — They are often used metaphorically and denote sinful affections — Their meaning frequently misunderstood — They occupy a large place in the writings of St. Paul — His mode of expressing his views of them probably grew out of some philosophical formula — He does not mean that sin is confined to the body alone — He regards the spirit of man as the seat of sin also — The representations of phrenological writers — The body or the flesh not necessarily sinful — It would have no connection with sin, did not the mind yield to its impulses and suggestions — Every species of sin not necessarily connected with the material body. p. 36

CHAPTER IV.

MATERIALISM.

The tendency of many minds towards materialism — The theory of materialists unphilosophical — Consciousness precludes the necessity of argument — We are conscious that what we call the *self* or *me*, is no part of our material organization — The fact that the mind seems to grow and decline with the body does not prove the materiality of the former — The difference between the brute mind and human mind. p. 55

CHAPTER V.

RESURRECTION OF THE BODY UNREASONABLE:

The body constantly undergoing change — A man at seventy has had ten different bodies — Which of them will be raised from the dead? — Pearson on the creed — The body falls into the earth and enriches it, out of which vegetables grow — If it is ever gathered and reconstructed, it will be needful that the decomposition of the whole vegetable and animal world take

place — Poets sometimes speak of the resurrection of the body, but it is unscriptural and unphilosophical— Not a particle of matter, that composed bodies which were laid in their graves thousands of years since, can be found there now — What propriety is there in saying that they will come out of their graves at the resurrection? — Not expected that all the body will be raised— enough of its dust will be found in the grave for a nucleus of the reconstructed fabric — The vegetable world analogically considered — So also the animal kingdom — There are a great variety of shades of belief on the subject — The general impression is that the last body, or the body which is consigned to the grave, is the one that will be raised — This supposition is beset with insuperable difficulties. p. 64

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

Some deny the immortality of the soul but believe that all men will be raised to immortality after they have slept ages in unconsciousness — The records of antiquity bear plainly upon their face the doctrine of the soul's immortality — No nation, ancient or modern, civilized or savage, has ever existed without some faith in the future life — Whence was it derived? — Some say from impostors — This not the fact — The Bible takes some things for granted — The writings of Moses do not assert in so many words that there is a God — The fact is assumed as though all would admit it — The existence of angels is assumed in the same way — Moses and the prophets hold out the idea that there is something in man that does live beyond the death of the body — It is inculcated in all those passages which speak of the dead as sleeping with their fathers — The Jewish views of Sheol, and the Scriptural references to that subject, afford farther evidence that the sacred writers recognized the existence of the soul after leaving the body — Another evidence of the same truth in the Old Testament, is derived from the use of the words which are rendered life, breath, soul, and spirit — We must go to the Christian records to obtain a full and clear view of the future life. p. 95

CHAPTER VII.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

Job 19: 25, 26, 27 — Isaiah 26: 19 — Daniel 12: 2. p. 137

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST.

Nothing is plainer taught in the New Testament than this event — The time of its taking place was plainly pointed out — The coming of Christ a progressive event — It is called by the inspired writers 'the last day' — The Old Covenant was to be destroyed near or at the commencement of the last day — This event was called the end of the world — The last day is spoken of by the New Testament writers as a resurrection day — The last day in the Scriptures to be a judgment day. p. 159

CHAPTER IX.

EXAMINATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

II. Timothy 4: 5 — 8 — Matthew 10: 28 — Matthew 5: 29, 30 — Matthew 27: 50, 53 — John 11: 23, 24 — Acts 2: 34. p. 184

CHAPTER X.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

The denial of the resurrection of Christ's body unreasonable and unscriptural — Christ's material body not the pattern of the resurrection bodies of other men, admitting it was raised from the dead — Not necessary to suppose it went into immortality — It could be dispersed into primary elements at his ascension — The resurrection of Christ's body not designed to prove the resurrection of any other bodies — The object of Christ's resurrection was to prove the divinity of his mission,

and consequently of all the truth he taught — The New Testament writers testify to this fact — It has had a powerful influence in the moral elevation of the world. p. 221

CHAPTER XI.

AN EXAMINATION OF I. CORINTHIANS XV:

Some of the Corinthian Church denied the resurrection of the dead — Paul's object in this chapter was, to correct this error — He adduces the resurrection of Christ as evidence of the resurrection of all men — Christ stood before the world as a pre-eminent proof of this — During his mediatorial reign, his disciples who had proved faithful unto death should stand next in rank, as evidence of the same fact — The reign of Christ and the result — The question, how are the dead raised up, answered — The phrase, "we shall not all sleep" examined — The word resurrection means future life — Objections considered — I. Thessalonians 4: 13 — 18, explained in connection with this chapter. p. 233

CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION.

Men die sinners — Death works no moral change — Why then, believe in the salvation of all men? — The promises of God which embrace the mission of Christ, the foundation of our faith — All men desire happiness — It is promised them — Moral and intellectual excellence constitutes all true happiness — Though death cannot confer these, yet the change of circumstances and condition, which is effected by death, will induce the individual to choose them — The body does not go into the immortal state — The principles of the Gospel of Christ do go there — And they can never cease to operate as long as there is a sinner in existence — Consequently all men must finally be brought to the knowledge of the truth and be saved. p. 270

THE FUTURE LIFE:

OR, IMMORTALITY AS REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

CHAPTER I.

DEATH THE KING OF TERRORS.

As the habits, sentiments, circumstances, and education of men are various, their feelings must vary in intenseness on any given subject; and, hence, the thoughts of death must excite very different feelings in different individuals. The patriarch Jacob, when his days were nearly numbered, and he felt the icy fingers of death upon his vitals, and realized that he must speedily go from all the scenes of mortal conflict, said to his most beloved son, "Behold I die." What his feelings were, at that period of thrilling interest, none can know but himself and that Great Being, who seeth and knoweth all. What are the emotions and thoughts, which gather around the last point of human existence, none can fully know till they arrive there.

Nevertheless, we are all somewhat acquainted with the sad circumstances which usually attend the last hours of the dying; and we have all felt the fearful sensations, roused by the grim shadows that linger

around the bed of death. We are, necessarily, familiar with the dread accompaniments of sickness and death; for they are on all sides of us. Now, we hear deep groans and suppressed sighs; we see gasps and struggles, and dark shades go over emaciated features, and sunken eyes suddenly glared and fixed in darkness. The limbs are now gradually becoming cold, stiff, and motionless; and insensibility has crept over the whole frame, and the pallid corpse hears not the wailings of sorrow that fill the air around it. Now the scene shifts, and we behold the shroud, the coffin, the open grave, and hear the gravel rattle in the narrow dwelling, and then see the green sods placed upon that gravel, and, after a few ceremonies are performed, the agitating occurrences of death seem to be forgotten by the multitude. But they are not; they are so momentous in their import, they cannot fail to impress us, for a short season, at least, with awe — to terrify even the most giddy and reckless, and make them shudder at the thought that they must soon meet the iron embrace of the pale king.

Death has always had power to fill the unregenerate heart with fear. He has long been termed the king of terrors. But why has he been thus denominated? Did the pains, which usually attend the hour of dissolution, induce the world to crown him king of terrors? No; we have reason to believe, from many and various considerations, that these pains are slight and of short duration, and that many a one has suffered more from injuries done their systems and recovered their health, than is ever inflicted by the hand of death.

Dr. William Hunter, who had seen as much of death's doings as almost any other man, said to a friend in his last moments, "Would that I were able, and I would write how easy and pleasant a thing it is to die." We are told by those who have had the best means of knowing something about this matter, that all the exhibitions of mortal agony are not real; they only seem to be such; and even the convulsive agitations, so often manifest, give no real evidence that the subject thereof is experiencing much physical pain; they are similar in character to epileptic spasms, which, as is well known, are produced in total insensibility; and, therefore, are not to be taken as proof of suffering in the least degree. The mere pain of dying, then, is not of all things the most terrible; and this is not what makes death the king of terrors. The thought of being dead—the thought of utter destruction—is indeed terrible. The idea of being swept into eternal oblivion is painful in the extreme. To feel that when a few more years, at most, shall have passed away, our whole being will be extinguished, totally extinguished, is chilling to the soul, and is enough to tear from us every pleasure, which present blessings are calculated to afford.

"A long, long, silent, dark, oblivious sleep,
A sleep which no propitious Power dispels,
Nor changing seasons, nor revolving years."

Thoughts like these few can endure. They are enough to make us plead with all possible earnestness for a continuance of existence, though it should be perplexed with many sore evils, and tormented by many severe pains.

In most cases, the man of affliction, broken down by disease and poverty, dreads less the evils of his condition than the extinction of his being; and he will cling to life, till crushed and tormented beyond endurance. He finally yields to an overpowering providence, but not willingly. He dies, but is not reconciled to his fate. Nothing but the thought that his existence will be continued and his condition improved will carry resignation and consolation to his soul. There is that in man, which makes him shrink with horror from the idea of annihilation; yet it is difficult to make him fully sensible of the stupendous fact that all must die. How shall we account for this, except on the ground that he cannot endure the thought of death? Is it not a strong love of life, which makes him listen with a degree of indifference to the most moving and pathetic descriptions of the shortness of life and the certainty of death?

It is not a hard task to persuade a man, who is fast sinking to the tomb under the weight of an incurable disease, that many years intervene between him and death. How easy is it to flatter the victim of consumption, — that most fatal of all maladies, — even when the hectic flush is on his cheek, that he will recover his health! And how anxious are those who are past cure, to try every medicine that may be recommended to them! they are not willing to give up, even when every supposed remedy within their reach has been applied without success. Still, life is sweet to them, and death is bitter, and they will cling to the former, though it bite like a serpent.

We have numerous illustrations of our mortality before our eyes continually. Yet we act as if they were all illusive and void of significance. The philosopher has been puzzled and the preacher pained at the seeming indifference of men on this subject. When there is so much transpiring every day to show us what our end must be — when every movement of time witnesses the departure of some spirit — when death-groans are constantly ringing in our ears, and friends and foes are rapidly retiring from life's busy stage, to make room for the multitudes that are ever rising to act their parts in the great drama of human existence, it would seem that we might be fully sensible of the shortness of life and the certainty of death. But it is not so. To-day a crowd is gathered around the grave of a departed fellow being; and there the preacher exhausts his store of eloquence, in portraying the frailty of man and the briefness of his stay upon earth; a few tears are shed, perhaps, and a few groans go forth from burdened souls; but the time for dispersion comes, and when to-morrow's sun looks down upon those that composed that throng, they are, to all human appearance, as thoughtless as though nothing had happened to warn them of the fleetness of their earthly career. The fact is, we can dwell with pleasure upon thoughts of life and enjoyment, but we are not disposed to meditate upon death. It is not congenial with our nature to look with complacency upon the darkness of the tomb; for to feel that we must sooner or later die, and lay down in the cold and silent grave, is unpleasant; indeed, as we have already said, it is

fearful, specially if our faith in immortality be weak ; and, therefore, when the thought of our dissolution intrudes itself upon us, we labor to get rid of it as soon as possible. And, doubtless, this love of life or desire for a continued existence, and weak faith, is the reason why men seem to think so little about dying. While in prosperity, they wish to live, and they put the evil day far from them, and act as though it would never come. In adversity, or old age, they are no more willing to die ; and most, though standing upon the last verge of mortal being, strive to banish every thought of death from their minds, because it is chilling to the aspirations of the soul.

It is obvious, from the foregoing remarks, that out of the love of life has grown the dread of death ; and so far as we believe that our existence terminates at the dissolution of the body, just so far is death terrible to us. Is death, then, a reality—that is, death in its broadest sense ? Is it really true that the present life is all the life we have to live, and that, when it terminates, our existence comes to a close ? Were God's providence so ordered that every natural desire of man must be disappointed, there would be more evidence than there is, that the grave is the last scene of human existence. Did I see man thirsting for knowledge, and laboring from childhood to old age without finding it ; did I see that the Author of his being had created him with an appetite for food and drink, and placed him in a world where it could never be gratified ; did I see nowhere in this great realm of life a supply for the demands of his social nature ; in

short, did I see that God had created him with a variety of wants, and had given him no means of supplying them, I might be more induced than I am to believe that the grave would be the end of human existence. But when I discover that there is bread for the hungry, water for the thirsty, light for the eye, sound for the ear, society for the lonely, and sympathy for the yearning heart; and when I behold nature unfolding the vast volume of her works, and exposing the secret recesses, where her jewels of truth are stored, to him who seeks for knowledge as for hidden treasures, I am constrained to believe that the universal desire for immortal life will be gratified.

But what saith the Bible about this matter? Its voice is yea and amen. It confirms, and throws a halo of light around the teachings of nature and reason; and this confirmation and light are the very things demanded to perfect our faith in the future life. Without them darkness would rest on all our theories. We might appeal to the constitution of the human mind, and array the teachings of nature and the deductions of reason against the doctrine of annihilation, and farther argue that the aspirations of the soul prove, beyond refutation, that man is destined to live after the death of the body; still, without the testimony of the Bible, our faith in immortality will be weak, and will soar heavenward on a trembling wing. On the contrary, that faith which is firmly based on the teachings of the Bible is strong and immovable. Who ever met death with a more confident hope than he who placed unwavering reliance on the doctrines of the

New Testament, and lived as they direct? and who ever had fewer doubts of the future life than he? Show me a man who receives the Bible as a sure guide to religious truth, and I will show you one who has strong faith in immortality. But it is, and always has been the case, that the man who has no confidence in the Bible has very little, if any, faith in the future life, though he may understand well the teachings of nature and reason on that subject. For example, turn back to the writings of the sages and philosophers of ancient times, who disregarded the Bible or had no knowledge of it, and see how they discoursed upon immortality. Cicero, after an extended examination of the subject, and presenting a variety of strong and lucid arguments on the nature and in favor of the future existence of the soul, says, "Which of these is true God alone knows, and which is most probable is a very great question." After examining all the speculations of antiquity, Seneca makes the following just remarks: "Immortality, however desirable, was rather *promised* than proved by those great men." Socrates remarked, a short time previous to his death, "I shall die, and you will continue to live; but which of us will be in the better state is known only to God. I *hope* I am going to good men, but this I would not confidently assert." Dr. Good, in speaking of the ancient theories concerning the future state, says, they were mere philosophical speculations, leaving the mind in "*utter doubt and indecision; hope perpetually neutralized by fear.*" The like may be said of the theories of all, in every age, who have rejected the Bible, or known nothing of its sentiments; their spec-

ulations have only tended to fill the mind with doubt, hope and fear. And we may repeat, that weak is that faith which is not based on the Revealed Word, whatever may be said about philosophy. "Philosophy," says one, whose name I do not remember, "philosophy can only heave a sigh, a longing sigh, after immortality. Eternity is to her an unknown vast, in which she soars on conjecture's trembling wing. Above—beneath — around, is an unfathomed void ; and doubt, uncertainty, or despair, are the result of all her inquiries."

Now look at the Bible, and see the difference. Those, in whose hearts its doctrines and precepts have sunk deep, and operated extensively, are not tossed about on the waves of doubt and fear. They stand firm amid the conflicting doctrines of men. They live the future life now, by faith ; and death to them is only a stepping-stone to immortality. How confident are they of living after the body is dead ! and with what joy do they speak of their destiny ! And one, by turning to the writings of the apostles, can see, at once, the difference between their faith and the faith of those, who in their day knew nothing of the Gospel. But they do not stand alone. There is ample testimony in the language of Christians, who have lived since, to prove that the Gospel has power to inspire a joyful faith as nothing else can. To substantiate this, we might quote volumes from the dying remarks of believers, but the following must suffice.

The case of the aged Polycarp, bishop of the church in Smyrna, is known to every one. When at the place

of execution, life was offered him if he would renounce Christ; he steadfastly refused, saying, "Eighty and six years have I served him, and he has done me nothing but good; why should I forsake him now?" Mr. Saunders, who was burnt at Coventry, on coming to the stake where he was to suffer, embraced it with apparent joy, exclaiming, "Welcome, cross of Christ! Welcome, everlasting life!" When Ridley and Latimer were bound together to the stake, the former said to his companion, "Be of good heart, brother; for God will either assuage the fury of the flame, or enable us to abide it." The latter replied, "Be of good comfort, for we shall this day light such a candle in England as, I trust, by God's grace, never shall be put out." The dying words of Bede, who departed this life A. D. 735, are very impressive. He said to one of his pupils, "I have some valuables in my little chest. Run quickly and bring all the priests of the monastery to me." When they came he distributed his small presents to them, and exhorted each of them to attend to their masses and prayers. They all wept when he told them they would see him no more; but rejoiced to hear him say, "It is now time for me to return to him who made me. The time of my dissolution draws near. I desire to be dissolved, and be with Christ. Yes, my soul desires to see Christ, my king, in his beauty." In this manner he continued to converse cheerfully till the evening, when a pupil said to him, "Dear master, one sentence is still wanting." He replied, "Write quickly." The young man said, "It is finished." He answered, "Thou

hast well said, all is now finished. Hold my head with thy hands, for I shall delight to sit on the opposite side of the room, on the holy spot at which I have been accustomed to pray, and where, while sitting, I can invoke my Father." When he was placed on the pavement of his little place, he sung, "Glory be to the Father and to the Son, and to the Holy Ghost;" and expired as he uttered the last words. Such was the happy, the glorious conclusion of life to this first of scholars.*

Here permit me to introduce a collection of the *Dying Sayings* of individuals, whose names are not mentioned. "Surely," said one in the act of dying, "the Lord is here." "I am wrapt," said another, "in the vision of God's love." Another felt that his soul had already begun to dissolve its connection with the body. "In fact," said he, "I know not whether I am in the body or out of it." "I feel," said one who was dying at the age of thirty-six,— "I feel like living forever." "My peace," said one as he was departing, "flows like a river." Another in a more rapturous emotion exclaimed, "Brother, heaven has come to me; it is in me and all around me. I am filled with God and glory." "I go," said one, "to join our dear friends who have gone before me, and they are not a few. We shall meet again in a better world." And when restored, for a little while, from what he and his friends thought a dying condition, he said, "A delightful feeling of peace, of freedom from

* Extracts from an article published in the *Christian Review*,

all pain and suffering, of withdrawal from the world, came over me.'*"

Dr. Joseph Priestly, when about to die, said, "We shall all meet finally ; we only require different degrees of discipline, suited to our different tempers, to prepare us for final happiness." Upon Mr. —— coming into his room, he said, " You see, sir, I am still living !" Mr. —— observed, he would always live. " Yes," said he, " I believe I shall, and shall meet again in another and better world." Rev. John Murry, when on his death bed, answered the question whether he was willing to depart, " O yes, yes, yes ; the glorious manifestations of divine love still brighten upon me." Rev. John Bisbe, pastor of the first Universalist Society in Portland, Me., when convinced in his own judgment, that his life was rapidly hastening to a close, fearing that his companion might not be fully sensible of his situation, expressed a wish to speak to her alone. An affecting scene occurred. She said when she approached the bed of the dying saint, he took her hand, and gently pressing it, said with a calm and dignified composure, " MERCY, I feel that I am going to leave you," and then, committing her to the protection of a benignant Providence, he bid her meet the event with the same calmness with which he had announced it. With the same collectedness, he gave directions as to the settlement of his temporal concerns. When the children were presented him, the dying father smiled upon them, and with a kiss, he

* From the Christian Register, a part of which the editor quoted from the Wesleyan Journal.

bid the tender innocents an affectionate farewell, trusting that the same God who had been his protector would preserve and bless them. He declared in the most unequivocal language, that he cherished the same religious sentiments which, as a minister, he had labored to establish, and desired that this fact, together with his dying blessing, should be communicated to his church and congregation.* Volumes of testimony of this character might be collected, but this must suffice.

This language was uttered by men believing in the Bible ; and was the like ever used by sceptics ? and was ever such faith enjoyed by men who have rejected or not understood the Gospel ? No ; it is not he who can only prate about flowers and butterflies, and expatiate upon the opening Spring and the recuperating energies of nature ; nor is it he who can only enter into a metaphysical disquisition on the nature and laws of spirit, or educe labored proof of immortality from the economy of the natural world, that has the strongest faith in the future life ; but it is he who has implicit confidence in the testimony of the Scriptures. What saith the Bible, then, is a question of momentous import, and demands the undivided attention and the most serious consideration of every human being.

To answer this question fully is not a small task, and should be approached with reverence and caution, especially when we remember how many have sought to perform it without success. Among those who have

* See *Happy Death Scenes*, by J. G. Adams.

had strong faith in the immortal destiny of our race, there have been various opinions in relation to the mode of our future existence, and the process by which it is to be attained. There have been numerous theories devised, and many appeals have been made to the Bible to sustain them, and doubtless many of them contained some truth ; yet it is pretty evident that none have been entirely free from error. This error and diversity of sentiment have unquestionably gendered doubts and despondency ; but we should remember, that as God does not seem pleased to give us truth without effort, nor to put us in possession of all the principles of his government at the very commencement of our inquiries, it becomes us to be grateful for what we do receive, and strive earnestly for more ; realizing that every ray of light cast upon the destiny of man gives strength to faith, and serves to dissipate the darkness of the tomb.

Hence, as our object is to find truth, perhaps we cannot pursue it better, than to examine, at the outset, so far as this inquiry renders proper, some of the systems which theologians have elaborated and defended, concerning the nature of the human soul or spirit, and its future existence.

CHAPTER II.

THE EMANATION THEORY.

THERE are certain crude notions floating about in many minds, of a very pernicious character, and when brought to bear on the human will, they fasten upon it the palsyng influence of fatalism. They are capable of being systemized to some extent, and when brought together and reduced to order, may be expressed thus : God is the great spiritual fountain from which all souls have issued. And as a fountain cannot send forth, at the same time, both bitter water and sweet, imperfect spirits cannot issue from the unmingled fountain of all moral perfection; and as the spirit of man is an emanation from the One Ineffable Essence — from the source of all spiritual excellence—it is, of course, free from all moral pollution when it proceeds from God and enters into the human body. Moreover, the spirit of man, being a part of the Great Universal Spirit, can no more sin than God himself, it can never be contaminated by its connexion with the body. All the moral turpitude of man springs from the flesh. The spirit never consents to acts of iniquity ; but, on the contrary, always remonstrates against the suggestions of the carnal nature ; consequently, neither sin nor any of its effects can ever exist where the flesh does not exist. Hence, when the body, which is of the dust,

through the instrumentality of death, returns to the dust as it was, then shall the spirit return to God, the fountain from which it emanated, and there be happy duration without end. This return, however, is of a peculiar character. As the drop that falls from the cloud returns to the great father of waters, and is swallowed up in the ocean from which it evaporated, so the spirit shall return to the Father of spirits, and be merged in his infinite perfections; and having thus become mingled with the Infinite Spirit, it will be happy beyond expression; because God is the embodiment of all the elements of perfect felicity.

This theory has many ugly features, and is cumbered with insuperable difficulties. Some parts of it indicate very strongly, that, when men die, they fall into a state proximating annihilation. We learn from it, that their bodies dissolve and mingle with the universe of matter, and their spirits, on leaving the materials which incased them, return to God and mingle with the Universal Spirit. Now let it be observed, that when the materials which compose the body of a man are dispersed and intermixed with inorganic matter, and his spirit merged in the Parent Spirit, his individuality is destroyed; and this, to all intents and purposes, is to annihilate his whole being. The thought of my losing my identity and individuality is as unpleasant and repulsive as, that I should be wholly struck out of existence. There is no difference to me, between falling into nonentity, and being deprived of conscious existence and a knowledge of myself.

Moreover, if the theory under consideration be true, sin has no existence in fact ; and all the Bible says with regard to it is neither true nor useful. To substantiate this, let me inquire, What is sin ? The answer is at hand. St. John says, that "Sin is the transgression of the law ;" that is, sin is the violation of some moral obligation. It would be manifestly wrong to suppose the apostle had reference to violation of physical or organic law ; for a person might violate both and suffer much pain, yet feel no consciousness of having committed sin,— feel none of the pangs which a guilty conscience inflicts. All the physical and organic laws in the universe might be violated, and unbounded misery produced thereby, but if the violation were unaccompanied by moral delinquency, no *sin* would be committed. Sin, then, according to the Gospel and common-sense, is the transgression of some moral law ; and it is plain, that unless we know what a moral law requires, and feel, in a degree, our obligations to obey its requirements, we are not amenable to it, and it is the same to us as though it did not exist at all. St. Paul says, that "sin is not imputed where there is no law ;" that is, where there is no law, there can be no transgression, and where there is no transgression, there no sin can be imputed. And of course, where there is no intelligence, there can be no law recognised, or no moral obligations felt ; so we may say with propriety, that, where there is no intelligence, there is no law, and can be no sin. Enlightened jurists do not consider a man, destitute of intelligence,

criminal, whatever may be the deed he perpetrates, and for the best of all reasons; he has not those powers of mind which can discriminate between right and wrong. The brute is never supposed to be capable of committing sin, simply because it has neither intelligence nor a moral nature. It cannot understand the requirements of a law. It cannot feel moral obligation. It cannot, therefore, commit sin. Before man can be considered a sinner, he must violate a moral law, which he understands and regards as obligatory. How absurd, then, to say, that the mind or spirit never commits sin or has any connexion with it, but that all moral turpitude springs from the body. The fact is, the mind or soul *has* some connexion with sin; it is the very thing culpable; for, without intelligence there could be no sin, and the body, as such, is not intelligent. But has this ever been denied? It has, as may be seen by the following: "May I not with propriety proceed another step, and assert, not only that sin does not proceed from the mind, but that *the mind or soul*, so far as it is enlightened, *never consents to wickedness*? When uninstructed in regard to the nature and influence of a certain action, the mind, of course, is not competent to decide upon its character, or determine whether it is right or wrong. Its assent to sin, under such circumstances, is unintentional and guiltless. But when the mind is clearly instructed in the principles of morality — when it is fully prepared to decide whether a deed is proper or sinful, does it ever then give consent to the sinful?"

"NEVER!" "Although, in these circumstances, the mind is in bondage to the propensities, and its higher promptings are lost sight of, in the whirl of unbridled appetites, still it participates not in their wickedness, but retains the integrity of its purer nature."*

As strange as it may seem, these sentiments have become so riveted in many minds, that it is almost impossible for them to receive anything else, however accordant with Scripture and reason. But, if true, it must be plain to all, that death is the only saviour men need or can have. The Scriptures represent that Christ came into the world to save them from their sins. According to the hypothesis stated above, men, as spiritual beings, have no sins; from what does he save them then? Does he save them from the "lusts of the flesh, and all the evil passions that distract and torment men on earth?" No; for these they carry about with them as long as they live; and when they die their spirits are delivered, and wing their way to God, having no taint of sin upon them, while the "lusts of the flesh, and all the evil passions that distract and torment men on earth, are left in the earth where they originated?"† Death, then, not Christ, is the saviour; and the record is untrue, which says, "and thou shalt call his name Jesus; for he shall save his people from their sins," and the apostle was mistaken when he said, "there is no other name under heaven given

* Expositor, Vol II, New Series, page 297.

† Williamson's Exposition of Universalism, page 18.

among men, whereby we must be saved." But do not such sentiments rob Christ of his glory, and give it to death? If so, I ask what sense is there in calling him a Saviour at all? It may be replied, that, He may be called a Saviour, because he revealed the character, government, and purposes of God, for by this revelation he saves those who believe, from the fear of death, and many other things, which we may not now specify. Be it so, still the question returns, Why not call him a *revealer* instead of a Saviour? He no more saves the world of mankind from sin, than the man, who, seeing his neighbor struggling in the water, saves him from drowning, by merely telling him that there are means provided for his rescue, which will not fail to effect his deliverance. Thus he may reveal a very cheering fact to the drowning man, but as for saving him, properly speaking, from a watery grave, he does not; certainly not, as Christ saves the world.

But look at the subject from another point of view. The Bible no where says that the spirit of man is an emanation; it does not inculcate the doctrine, that God infused into man a portion of his own nature. If it did, would it not be pernicious in its influence? It would make God the only moral force in the universe; thereby annihilate man, as a moral accountable agent, and make him a mere bubble, springing out of the Universal Soul, and soon vanishing into it again, without a destiny to accomplish, or a hope that his field of improvement will reach beyond the present world.

Perhaps it may be asked, if Gen. 2 : 7, is not strong proof of what we deny ? It is often argued, I know, that as " God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and man became a living soul," he must have received into himself a portion of the Deity, and that this constitutes his immortality. But this is all assumption ; the like is not intimated in the passage. All that can be said of it, is, that God breathed into man the breath of life, and man became a living *person* ; for, according to Calmet, the original word rendered *soul* simply means person. In Gen. 1 : 27, we have something definite on this subject. We read, that " God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him ; male and female created he them." Here it is very positively declared that God *created* man in his own image ; as the Great Supreme is a spirit, and infinite in all his attributes, immutable and unlimited in the essential qualities of his nature, and as all material bodies are limited and changeable, it is evident that the body of man is not in the image of God. The conclusion is, therefore, inevitable, that his soul, spirit, or his moral and intellectual powers, were created after the nature and perfections of Deity. And between the words, create and emanate, there is a very broad difference in signification. To create, is to make something by a simple effort of power, without the use of materials, and without any known process ; and is, of course, what none but God can do. To emanate, when personally applied,

is to send forth, from an individual agent, particles or portions of his own body. Now, may we not, with propriety, ask the advocates of this emanation doctrine, whether God suffered any diminution by transfusing a portion of his own spirit into man ; and whether it is not as consistent to say, that the heavens and the earth are an emanation from God, as that the spirit of man is? The Scriptures say, that "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and also that he "created man in his own image." I suppose, none will doubt that the word *create* implies as much when referring to man, as when referring to the heavens and the earth, and no more.

Finally, it is not a doctrine of Scripture, nor is it reasonable to suppose, that the spirit of man, after it has left the body, will be re-absorbed in the bosom of Deity, and thus lose its individuality. The body, to be sure, returns, at death, to its mother earth ; because it has accomplished the object for which it was made, it soon mingles with the dust, and perhaps the elements go to make up other bodies or organizations, and all that constitutes its identity or individuality is gone. But it is not so with the spirit, which has a higher destiny than to occupy the body for a short space, and then vanish into a state of unconsciousness. It is capable of more glorious things than to rise up and float a short season on the wave of time, and then sink into a state of individual annihilation. Wherever, in all the works of God, we discover the capability of any particu-

lar attainment, we see that *that* attainment was purposed. And what God hath purposed is sure. Hence, we cannot believe that an intelligence which is able to perpetually advance, as is the soul, to higher regions of spiritual life ; or, in other words, which is unbounded in its aspirations, and its moral and intellectual capabilities, will perish almost as soon as the insect, destined to flit and glitter only a few days in the summer's sun. The soul has had a conscious existence here, and dwelt in a body adapted to this mode of being ; through this body she has maintained intercourse with the outer world, and when this material body is thrown off, she only needs to be clothed upon by another body, adapted to the constitution of the world or state into which she is ushered, to enable her to retain her identity, and communicate with the objects and intelligences around her. It is, therefore, reasonable to conclude, that the body may return to the dust as it was, and the spirit to God ; not to lose its individuality, but to hold a closer communion with Him than ever before, and see Him with a new light in all his works, and enjoy more by this immediate communion than man has ever imagined. Entertaining such views, we "rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory."

But it may be asked here, whether, in taking the position that the body or flesh, in itself, is not capable of committing sin, we have not contradicted one of the plainest doctrines of the Bible ? This question the reader will find answered in the following chapter.

CHAPTER III.

FLESH, BODY, &c., AS THE CAUSE OF SIN.

IN the New Testament, we find the terms *flesh*, *flesh and blood*, *body*, &c., used in various senses. Besides the proper meaning, which it is unnecessary to illustrate, they have several of a metaphorical kind, some of which are nearly related to the literal idea, and some but remotely connected with it. "Flesh and blood" sometimes denotes men living in this world. 'Thus, when Peter confessed that Jesus was "the Christ, the Son of the living God," our Saviour replied, "Blessed art thou, Barjona, for flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven ;" that is, Peter had not received this truth from men, but from God. St. Paul says, when alluding to his own conversion, "Immediately I conferred not with flesh and blood, neither went I up to Jerusalem, to them which were apostles before me ;" meaning that he sought counsel of no man. "We wrestle not," says he again, "with flesh and blood, but with principalities and powers, against the rulers of the darkness of this world:" we contend not bodily against the physical strength of men, as do the wrestlers in Grecian games, but against evil authorities and influences. In a similar sense, the single term *flesh* is sometimes used, as a generalization, for living men. Said Christ, with reference to the

destruction of the Jewish State, "Except those days be shortened, there shall no flesh be saved;" that is, no people will otherwise survive. "All flesh shall see the salvation of God;" all the world shall behold it. "By the deeds of the law," says St. Paul, "shall no flesh be justified," or no living person. Of husband and wife, it is frequently said, "they twain shall be one flesh," or one person in the relations of the present life.

But we find, in the New Testament, another metaphorical usage of these and similar terms, which is of a more remarkable character, since it involves a moral element. The flesh, the body, or its members, often denote sinful affections, or rather the immediate impulses that lead to sin. Every careful reader of the New Testament must have observed how frequent and favorite representation it is, that the flesh, the body, its members, &c., are of sinful influence, and that whatsoever is done by these is morally corrupt. St. Paul says, "I know that in me, that is, in my flesh, is no good thing." And again: "The flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh; and these are contrary the one to the other." All sin is thus attributed to the flesh; and this, not only when it is of such a kind that we can trace some natural connection between it and the body, as in the case of lewdness and other corporeal excesses, but also when the sin is such as appears to belong solely to the mind, as envy, pride, impiety, false religion, superstition, &c. It is said, "The works of the flesh are manifest, which are these:

adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, *idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulations, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings*, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." On the other hand, the mind or spirit of man, contrasted with the flesh or body, is sometimes represented as pure, and as according thoroughly with the law of God, at the same time that the latter is striving to maintain the dominion of sin. Says the apostle, "I delight in the law of God after the inward man; [that is, the mind] — but I see another law in my members warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin. . . . So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Nor is this manner of representation confined to a few insulated texts, as if it were accidental; it fills a large space in the New Testament, occurs in a variety of forms, and appears to be of familiar use, so that it must be underlaid by some general principle.

We think, however, that the meaning has been frequently misunderstood, by taking the language in too literal a sense, and by overlooking other considerations that manifestly belong to the subject. We think, too, that the mistake has led to some wrong conclusions, which affect our view of the nature of sin and righteousness, and that obscure the relations we hold as moral agents. We therefore venture on the subject, with the hope of contributing somewhat towards clearing it up, though we do not expect to bring out, into perfect light,

every thing that belongs to it. Even should we mistake on some points, the error may serve to set others on exploring the field, and lead them to complete what we here begin.

The first thing to be observed is, that the representation spoken of, as occupying so large a space in the New Testament, is, nevertheless, peculiar to St. Paul's writings. Nowhere else do we meet with any clear and unquestionable instance of it, under whatever form, though there are a few expressions in the other writers, that might, perhaps, be referred, if necessary, to the same general signification. Thus, St. John says, when speaking of those who first believed in Christ, that "they were born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God;" where, however, the meaning probably is, that their new birth was not by physical agency, by "the will of the flesh," like the first, nor indeed by those influences that prevailed among men, but by the spirit of God. Christ also says to Nicodemus; who had just affected to take the new birth literally, as but a repetition of the natural birth—"that which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the spirit is spirit." But here it is doubtful whether he means more than that such a new birth, as Nicodemus had just suggested, would be only a corporeal one, like the first, and the spirit of God alone could transform us into spiritual men. In his agony at Gethsemane, he told his drowsy disciples to watch and pray, lest ye fall into temptation; "the spirit indeed is willing but the flesh is

weak ;" evidently alluding to that corporeal sensitiveness which would give rise to animal fear, or fear of corporeal suffering. On another occasion, he told the Jews, "Ye judge according to the flesh ;" that is, according to outward appearances ; on which ground they denied that he was "the light of the world," as the context intimates. Were Christ accustomed, like St. Paul, to use the term flesh to designate the impulses to sin, we might suppose that he did so in this text, and that the meaning was, "Ye judge according to your sinful propensities." But the passage quite as naturally admits the sense we have given it, and we do not find the other usage in our Saviour's phraseology. St. Peter seems to have come nearer than the rest of the inspired writers, to St. Paul's idea of the flesh. "I beseech you," says he, "as strangers and pilgrims, abstain from fleshly lusts, which war against the soul." It is not improbable, however, that by fleshly lusts he meant only those which obviously proceed from bodily appetites, such as we commonly call lusts, and not sin in general. But in another place he says, "Forasmuch as Christ hath suffered for us in the flesh, arm yourselves likewise with the same mind ; for he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin," where, it would seem, he means, hath ceased from sin in general ; thus connecting all kinds of sin with the flesh, in such a way that crucifying this would prevent them. Except St. Paul's writings, this is the only passage in which such a connection appears to be recognised between the body and sin in general,

as distinguished from those particular vices which spring directly from the corporeal appetites. And even here, it is questionable whether St. Peter did not refer specially to the latter, instead of having all the varieties of sin distinctly in his view: "he that hath suffered in the flesh hath ceased from sin, that he should no longer live the rest of his time in the flesh to the lusts of men, but to the will of God. For the time past of our lives may suffice to have wrought the will of the Gentiles, when we walked in *lasciviousness, lust, excess of wine, revelling, banquetings, and abominable idolatries,*" in which the most shameful indulgences were practised. It is evidently to these that he refers, in other expressions of the kind, as in the following: "The Lord knoweth how * * * to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished; but chiefly them that walk after the flesh in *the lust of concupiscence,* and despise government;" where those who walk after the flesh, are one particular class of offenders. "For when they speak great swelling words of vanity, they allure through the lusts of the flesh, through *much wantonness,*" or lasciviousness. So, too, Jude says "Likewise, also, these dreamers defile the flesh, (practise obscenity,) despise dominion," &c. He exhorts his brethren to save some of these with fear, "pulling them out of the fire, hating even the garment spotted by the flesh." In these latter examples, the reference plainly is to excessive indulgence of what are properly called **bodily appetites.**

Such is the manner in which the terms in question are employed in all parts of the New Testament, except the writings of St. Paul. But when we pass into these, we find the phraseology habitually used in a new sense. According to him, all sin is the work of the flesh, and in the flesh there is nothing good. To be carnal, or fleshly, is to be opposed to God. He contrasts the mind or the inner man with the body or flesh; and speaks of the one as pure in all its exercises, and the other as always corrupt. All this representation, and all such phraseology, are confined to him. We may therefore suspect that they grew out of some peculiar formula of a philosophic kind, which he alone, among the writers of the New Testament, had, from his more extensive learning, been familiar with. And this conjecture will be strengthened, if we shall find that the distinction between him and them is rather verbal or rhetorical than real. It will indicate that he but borrowed the language of certain speculative hypotheses, to express a meaning that was common to all the apostles.

In proceeding now to a closer observation of his real doctrine, we will begin by showing that, notwithstanding the seeming purport of his language in many places, he does not mean that sin is confined to the body exclusively. He regards the mind of man, and even the spirit of man, as the seat of moral corruption, equally with the body. Writing to the Ephesians he reminds them that formerly they "walked according to the course of this world, accord-

ing to the prince of the power of the air, the *spirit* that now worketh in the children of disobedience ; among whom we all had our conversation in time past, in the lusts of the flesh and of the *mind*." Again, he says to the Corinthians, "Let us cleanse ourselves of all filthiness of the flesh and of the *spirit*." Here the lusts of the mind and the filthiness of the spirit are placed on the same ground with those of the flesh. Other instances from St. Paul's writings, are the following : " As they did not like to retain God in their knowledge, God gave them over to a reprobate mind," or an impure, adulterated mind. 'To the Ephesians he says, "Walk not as other Gentiles walk, in the vanity of their mind." To the Colossians he speaks of one who is "vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind." He warns Timothy, repeatedly, of "men of corrupt minds," and mentions "seducing spirits." To Titus he says, "Unto them that are defiled and unbelieving, is nothing pure ; but even their mind and conscience is defiled." He frequently exhorts us "to be renewed in our minds," and "in the spirit of our minds ;" implying, of course, that our minds and the spirit of them are wrong.

From all this, we see how gross a mistake it would be to suppose St. Paul confines sin to the body alone, or regards the mind, the spirit of man, as incorrupt. He means nothing of this kind, even when he says that he delights in the law of God after the inward man, while the law in his members wars against the law of his mind, bringing him into captivity to the law of sin. Indeed, the mere body

or flesh, strictly speaking, can never sin, though it may work temptations. When taken by itself, it is neither intelligent nor conscious, and is as incapable of moral transgression as any other unintelligent mass of matter. And even when united with mind, as it is in every rational person, it is the mind which feels, knows, and acts through the body as its instrument. It is the mind which recognizes motives, controls impulses, or yields to them; it is the mind which forms within itself the purpose, whether good or bad, and then executes it in overt acts by means of the body. The mind is the real agent; and it is the mind alone that is guilty and condemned, in the case of sin. If it should be said that this contradicts St. Paul's assertion, that with the mind he served the law of God, but with the flesh the law of sin, we will, for the argument's sake, grant what is not strictly true, that there is a contradiction in words; but is there any in the meaning? Will any one contend, seriously, that in serving the law of sin, the mind takes no part, neither premeditates nor desires, nor balances motives, nor comes to a determination, nor wills, nor puts forth the effort; but that all this is done by about a hundred or two pounds of mere bone, flesh, and blood, without any co-operation of the mental power? The utter absurdity of the supposition ought itself to be a sufficient guard against the misapprehension of the passage referred to; but if this be not enough to satisfy every one, the matter will be put at rest by appealing to St. Paul's habitual recognition of corrupt, defiled, lustful, repro-


bate, filthy, vain, unrenewed minds and spirit in man. The other writers of the New Testament agree with St. Paul on this point. St. James says, "The *spirit* that dwelleth within us lusteth to envy." How often do we read in the gospels, of "unclean spirits!" — an expression which, though borrowed from the popular notion of demons, could hardly have been retained by the evangelists, had they held the absolute and inevitable purity of all spirits. St. John says, "Believe not every spirit; but try the spirits whether they be of God." We have said that, properly speaking, the body never sins; for, of itself, it is not intelligent to take cognizance of any moral law. For the same reason, neither can the blind appetites of the body sin. The farthest they can go in this direction is, to operate on the mind as impulses or incitements to wrong. If the mind does not consent to an improper indulgence of them there is no sin, how strongly soever they rage; if it does consent, there is sin, how slightly soever they be felt. It is the determination of the mind that gives the act a moral character; and without such determination there can be neither sin or righteousness, let the body or the appetites do what they may.

We have seen representations, especially in some phrenological writers, that seemed, at least, to imply that sin is confined to the lower propensities, leaving our higher powers always pure and guiltless. They begin by personifying, unconsciously perhaps, the affections, faculties, and operations of our nature, as

they are said to be manifested by the respective organs; and then they treat each of these as a separate agent, complete in itself, having a will, judgment, and responsibility of its own, as if every single man were but a community of individuals, some of which are scoundrels, and some angels; each, however, acting by itself, and answerable for itself. Thus, to use the phrenological nomenclature, our alimentiveness sins, by passing over the proper limits of its office into intemperance; our destructiveness, combativeness, self-esteem, amativeness, &c., in a similar way, or by misdirection. But here let us ask, Is it alimentiveness, &c., that is guilty in these cases? or is it the man himself as an intelligent being? is it the blind propensity, say of destructiveness, or of amativeness, that is conscience-smitten, struck with remorse, made wretched, and that sometimes repents? or is it the person, he who indulged these impulses unlawfully? Which of the two is it that commits the sin, and suffers the consequences? and then, on the other hand, is it the abstract tendencies to benevolence, reverence, conscientiousness, &c., that are self-approved and blessed? or is it he who purposely exerts and directs them? Which of the two is the conscious agent, who thus serves the law of God and receives the reward? In all these cases, it is not the impulses that are either good or bad, except as means. There must be an intelligent person to whom they belong, and whose mind, whose will, directs them before they can have any moral character; and he alone is either the

agent or the responsible subject. Witness the case of brutes, which have many of these impulses in full vigor. Nor must St. Paul be understood to contradict this conclusion, self evident as it is. Even when he speaks of serving the law of God with his mind, and the law of sin with his flesh, he still recognizes the fact that it is he himself who is the agent in both cases : " So with the mind, *I myself* serve the law of God ; but with the flesh the law of sin."

Another thing must be observed here. Whatever be the verbal form of the expression which St. Paul sometimes adopts, he does not mean that the body of flesh is *necessarily* of corrupt influence, so that it cannot be made the medium of righteousness, or that there is any thing in it which may not be used for good. He means that all this depends immediately on the person himself, on his will, on the determination of his mind ; and, accordingly, he brings exhortations to bear on these faculties. Says he, " Let not sin, therefore, reign in your mortal bodies ;" of course, his brethren might prevent this, by a right exercise of the mind. Again : " If the spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead, dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mental bodies, by his spirit that dwelleth in you ;" that is, shall make your bodies the outward organs of the internal spiritual life ; for the context shows he means their sanctification in the present mortal state. To the Romans he says, referring to their former condition while un-



converted, "As you have yielded your members servants to uncleanness and to iniquity, unto iniquity ; even so now yield your members servants of righteousness, unto holiness." Again : "Neither yield ye your members as instruments of unrighteousness, unto sin ; but yield yourselves unto God, as those that are alive from the dead, and your members as instruments of righteousness unto God." Of course, he held that "the members," or the body, might be devoted to sin or to righteousness, just according to the mind of the man. "I beseech you, therefore, brethren, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." Other expressions of the same general import, are the following : "Now, the body is not for fornication, but for the Lord." (Here mark, the latter was its legitimate, moral use ; the other is but a perversion.) "Your bodies," says he, "are the members of Christ. Your body is the temple of the Holy Ghost which is in you." "Therefore, glorify God in your body and in your spirit, which are his." "I pray God that your whole spirit, soul and body be preserved blameless unto the coming of our Lord." He speaks of the unmarried woman, who "careth for the things of the Lord, that she may be holy both in body and spirit." Referring to the incessant persecutions they endured, he says, "We are always delivered unto death for Jesus's sake, that the life also of Jesus might be made manifest in our mortal flesh." Nothing can be plainer than that the apostle recognised the flesh, the body, its members, &c., as

the instrument of righteousness, if they were properly used, and that he makes it depend on the person's will, or faculty of determining whether they should be employed this way or in sin. In this one respect the body was merely an unconscious instrument, subject to the use and direction of the mind.

At this stage it will be well to sum up what we have already ascertained of the apostle's real doctrine on the general subject: First, That the mind, the spirit of man, becomes itself corrupt; and, if common sense may be trusted, that here is the only seat of sin, in any sense that includes moral guilt, self-condemnation, remorse, repentance, &c. Second, That though an impulse towards sin is attributed to the body, yet the body may, nevertheless, be used to serve God, just as well as it may be used to transgress. And, third, That whether it shall be made to act for evil, or for good, depends not upon itself, but on the person, the moral agent, who determines the whole so far as respects the immediate cause. We think it will be seen at once, that this, the real meaning of St. Paul, is the same with that of the other inspired writers on the subject; and that he differs from them only in the manner of expressing it, by a more frequent and extensive use of the term flesh as a metaphor.

We may now advance to another consideration. From the foregoing facts, it will be readily perceived, that whenever St. Paul speaks of the flesh, the body, or its members, as the seat of sin, he does not use those terms in their simple and proper sense, as denoting the physical constitution. He means something

else ; say, the influence that is exerted on the mind by the bodily appetites and senses ; or, which amounts to the same thing, the propensity of the person to submit to their control over the mind. This may be clearly exemplified by his language in many passages. Speaking of a vicious person in the Corinthian church, he advises “to deliver such an one unto Satan, for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus ;” where it would be absurd to suppose it his meaning, to destroy the flesh literally ; that is, to put the offender to death, or to maim him. It was, to correct the vicious habit and disposition he had formed, — to make him break his mental thralldom to sensual gratification. Again : alluding to the unconverted state in which his brethren had formerly been, the apostle says, “When we were in the flesh, the motions (*literally* passions) of sins, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death ;” where he implies that, though still living in the body, they were no longer in what he here calls the flesh, that is, in a moral state of subjugation to the senses. “So, then,” he says, “they that are in the flesh cannot please God ; but ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the spirit of God dwell in you,” — asserting what was implied in the former quotation, that while they were still in the flesh, literally speaking, they were not in the flesh as he uses the term. “And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin ;” not, however, the physical body, for *that* would retain all its properties ; but the affections prompted by it. “O wretched

man that I am," exclaims he, "who shall deliver me from the body of this death?" — not that his wish was to die, to be delivered from this physical body; for this was to be employed in the service of God; and, moreover, he immediately adds, that the deliverance he sought was to be obtained "through the Lord Jesus Christ," or through faith in him. In all these cases, it is evident that, by the flesh, the body, its members, &c., he means the domination of the senses, in the mind, to the neglect of the spiritual development of our nature.

And now, as to the nature of that connection, which is thus recognised, between sin and the body, (using this latter term here in its proper signification) what is it when drawn out in detail, and stated in direct language? Evidently, nothing more than the following: — The senses, so far as respects their outward organization, belong to the body; for without the body we should, of course, have no organs of seeing, hearing, tasting, &c., nor any animal feeling, whether of animal pleasure to entice us, or of animal suffering to deter. These senses always lie in contact with the mind, with the will; and they communicate to it impulses, which must be either controlled or yielded to, by some exertion of the mental power. If we mistake not, it is these impulsive influences which St. Paul, in the passage referred to, calls the flesh, body, members, &c.; because, in most cases, at least, they proceed from the flesh. Up to this point, however, there is no sin in the case. But now, if the person voluntarily follows these impulses too far, or

neglects to restrain them within their proper limits, then sin begins, and not till then, — begins and continues in his will, or governing faculty. To walk according to these impulses is what St. Paul means by walking according to the flesh ; to live in them is to live in the flesh, as he uses the term ; to have our minds subjected to them is to be carnally or fleshly minded ; to overcome their predominating influence is to destroy the body, or to crucify the flesh ; the affections and acts in which they result, when not controlled, are the works of the flesh, in his language.

If we look back, it will be seen that the several views, which we have found so clearly presented in his general doctrine on the subject, do not admit of any closer connection than this, between the physical and moral elements of the case. He holds that the mind becomes corrupt, and needs to be renewed ; that the body may be used in the service of God, or in sin, just accordingly as the mind is disposed ; and whenever he speaks of the flesh, the body, or its members, as the agent of sin, the terms are highly metaphorical. The occasion of his using these terms in so remote a sense, was, probably, that they were suggested by some of the forms of Oriental philosophy, which prevailed among the learned, in his age and country. According to this, all evil was confined to matter, and all human sin to the flesh, simply as matter, which was supposed to be intrinsically corrupt, Nothing good could come of it, be it used in what way soever ; and our duty, with respect to it, was, to macerate and mortify the body itself, instead of at-

tempting the impracticable task of making it the instrument of righteousness. The apostle, however, was very far from adopting that doctrine, as we have seen, though he borrowed some of its phraseology. This it was natural that he should do, accustomed as he must have been to hear its language employed on such subjects, in the circle in which he moved.

A question may arise, whether, as matter of fact, every species of sin is necessarily connected with the physical body, either in this way or in any other. Many kinds of sin are, indeed, obviously so connected, at least in the outward form in which they are manifested ; while they still have their ultimate ground in some infirmity of the moral nature. Such are intemperance and all excessive indulgence of the corporeal appetites ; and it is worthy of remark, that these are represented as sins of the flesh, lusts of the flesh, &c., by other inspired writers, as well as by St. Paul, and indeed by mankind in all ages. Then, there are the sins of overweening devotion to worldly objects, as the means of gratifying our senses ; and these may be brought into a remoter connection of the same kind. But it would be difficult, perhaps, to trace out any such relation, in the case of certain other sins, that lie deep in the human mind. What part, for instance, does the body appear to have in prompting the feelings, say, of pride, envy, selfishness, irreverence, &c. ? We will not deny that, in some way unknown, it may have an influence to excite them ; but, so far as we can see, they affect the individual only as a conscious, intelligent being, in his relations

to other beings, no matter whether clothed in flesh or not. It would seem that he must be capable of those feelings in any condition in which self-esteem and self-love become excessive. It may be objected that St. Paul expressly names envy, and other feelings of the same class, among the works of the flesh. But considering in how remote a sense he unquestionably uses this term, here, we confess we have doubts whether he distinctly meant to assert that all those affections arose in the mind simply from its connection with the body. As the most obvious and striking sins were occasioned by that circumstance, is it unnatural to suppose that he might, in popular discourse and for convenience' sake, rank all the rest together in the same category, according to the technical phraseology to which he had been accustomed? We will not, however, insist on this. If a phrenologist should plead that all these feelings are manifested through certain *bodily organs*, it would be sufficient to remind him that so, too, are benevolence, conscientiousness, reverence, &c., according to his science; and that if the former are, therefore, sins of the flesh, the latter are virtues of the flesh. The question is not, whether all these affections have peculiar organs by which they are manifested; nor how they are manifested; but, whence do they arise? It should always be remembered, in inquiries of this kind, that phrenology, whether true or false, deals only with circumstantials. It is but skull-deep, and does not reach down into the internal operations of the mind.

CHAPTER IV.

MATERIALISM.

ALL who are in any considerable degree acquainted with the theological controversies of the present day, cannot be ignorant of the fact, that many minds have a strong tendency to materialism. We frequently hear those who profess to believe in the immortal destiny of our race, expressing doubts whether man is endowed with any higher powers than those which result from material organization. They agree with the materialist that mind is the effect of organization ; and when this is broken up by death, conscious existence ceases. Their faith in immortality is based on the resurrection, which they say is to be simultaneous with the whole human race, and to take place at some period yet future. All are to sleep in an unconscious state, "till the great rising day," then shall they go forth to an immortal life.

But few words are needed to show the unsoundness of this theory. Nothing can be more unphilosophical than to say that mind is the result of organization ; for it is to say that an effect can be produced without a cause, or that matter can impart qualities which it never possessed. To substantiate this, let us enquire what are the qualities of matter before it is organized ? Are they intelligent ? Do they compare, reason, remember, reflect ? No ; no one is so insane as to

contend for this. Then if matter possesses no intelligence previous to organization, is it not absurd to say, it imparts what it never possessed, merely by being combined in a certain way? Every effect must have an adequate cause. Unintelligent matter is not adequate to the production of intelligence. Therefore, whatever imparts or produces intelligence, must itself be intelligent. And as unorganized matter is not intelligent, it follows that it cannot impart properties which never belonged to it, however it may be arranged or combined.

But again; what is matter? What it is in the abstract we cannot tell. What it is in its essence none but God can know. To the senses it appears in various forms and under immutable principles of government, but absolutely negative of intellectual properties. We know as little of spirit or mind, in the abstract, as we do of matter. All we can say of it is, that it thinks, reasons, invents, remembers, hopes, believes, doubts, loves, and is susceptible of pleasure or pain. We have as much reason to believe in the existence of the one as the other. We are conscious of the existence of both.

He who is in the habit of looking into himself and noting what passes there, is conscious of possessing a mind which is mysteriously connected with his perishable body. And consciousness is above all argument. It is like a self evident proposition, which cannot be made plainer by the most luminous illustrations, or stronger by the most logical deductions. The man who has clear optics, and stands under a

cloudless sky at mid-day, needs no argument to prove to him that the sun shines. His consciousness of the fact transcends all arguments, however lucid or cogent. Like this fact, there are many other self-evident truths, which cannot be made more credible by proof; the mind recognises them as axioms. All who are sane believe in their own existence, in the existence of the sensible world, in the existence of matter. But why do they thus believe? There cannot be a single argument adduced to prove either our own existence or that of the material world. We believe in the existence of both, not because we can prove that they exist, but because we are conscious of the fact, and this consciousness precludes the need of proof. How do we know that we are not beasts, stocks, or stones? All we can say in reply is, we are conscious that we are neither wood, nor stones, nor brute beasts; and nothing more in the way of proof is required or can be had. So are we conscious that the essential property which constitutes our identity, which we call the *self*, or the *me*, is not a figment of the brain, nor cannot be made more intense by any proof whatever, so far as we are able to discover.

Hence, we have as good reason for believing in the existence of our moral and spiritual nature, as we have for believing that we exist at all, or that matter exists.

When one says, "my hand, my foot, my brain"—what does he mean? Does he mean that the brain belongs to the brain, and that the foot belongs to the foot, etc.? No; there is something behind all these,

which we call the *me*, and to which all the bodily organs belong; and were any of them destroyed, the *me* would still remain sound and perfect as before. But perhaps the materialist is ready to affirm that, if the head is severed from the body, the *me* is totally destroyed. In reply to this, it is sufficient to say, that there are doubtless "parts vital to the organization considered as a whole, but it does not follow, that these vital parts constitute the power, which moves, controls, and uses this organization. Take for an illustration, a mill turned by water power. There are many unessential parts added to extend its operation, and render the whole more perfect and exact. Let these be taken away, and yet the mill will go. But break down the water-wheel and the whole will stop. What then? The water-power which drove the water-wheel, does that stop? No. The communication only between the two has been cut off, and the work necessarily stops. Just so it is with the brain. Destroy the brain, and you have cut off the communication between the *me*, the *self*, and the organization; and the whole organization dies. In the case of the mill, what represented the *me*, was not the whole machine, or the water-wheel, but the water-power; and this will exist just as before, though the wheel stops or the whole mill be broken in pieces, and scattered to the four winds, or mouldered into dust."*

The materials which compose the body of an individual at ten years of age, pass into other forms before he is twenty, and are replaced by other and

* Dr. Walker's Lectures.

different particles of matter ; yet the mind still retains its conscious ideality. And this fact is a strong proof that the mind of man, though closely connected with matter during this life, is still something distinct from matter. The individual, though his body may have changed a dozen times during his life, knows that he is still the same person — that his organization is the same ; yet what does his body or bodily organization know about this fact ? Just nothing at all. It is the mind that possesses this knowledge or conscious identity, and ever will possess it, whatever changes the body may undergo. In opposition to this it is sometimes argued, however, that when the body is mature and healthy, the mind has the most strength and activity ; but when disease fastens upon it and wastes it away, the mind seems to grow weak and decay with it, and that, therefore, the mind arises from bodily organization and becomes extinct when this organization is destroyed. The proper answer to this, is, that the spirit needs, and has material organs, through which it manifests itself, and holds intercourse with the outward world. These organs may be injured and destroyed by disease, and the mind, therefore, be deprived of the medium through which it acts on sensible things, but it no more follows that it is destroyed, than it follows that the painter's skill is destroyed because he has lost the hand with which he executed his works of art. Give him another hand and he will be able to manifest his talent ; so give the spirit a new and proper medium through which to act, and it will show that the destruction of the old organs has not impaired its own powers.

It may be suggested here, perhaps, that the arguments we have employed to prove the immateriality of the human mind, will also prove that the sentient and thinking principle in brutes is of the same quality and destiny. But it should be noticed that there is a very great difference between the human mind and the brute mind. God has given to matter a variety of forms, and infused into each, powers and principles peculiar to the wants and destiny of each. The lowest in order is the mineral. It is fixed to the spot where it is found, by gravitation. It has no vitality, and grows by accumulation. One step above the mineral is found the vegetable kingdom. Here we find forms endowed with principles of life, and with power to rise above the surface of the ground. They are curiously wrought with delicate texture, and are susceptible of injury. The next in order is the animal kingdom. Here we find life in its most perfect state. Locomotion is given to animals, so that they can move about on the earth and provide for their wants, and to a certain extent, defend themselves against injurious inflictions. They possess various powers and capabilities which are denied all lower forms of matter. At the head of the animal kingdom stands man. Below him are animals of various forms and capabilities ; but among them all there is not one that can rise above the sphere which nature has assigned to those species to which it belongs. The snail cannot become a bird, nor the fly an eagle, nor the fish a lion ; nor any of the lower animals possess those peculiar elements which enter into the human mind and

constitute man what he is. The power of progress is denied them. Their first piece of work is performed as well as their thousandth—is as perfect. The honey-bee builds her comb with no more finish or completeness than her ancestors did fifty or even a thousand years ago ; nor does the bird her nest, nor the beaver his dam. Neither is wiser than its progenitors, neither is able to improve upon the first effort. We have abundant reason to believe that all the lower animals, which lived a thousand years ago, performed the tasks assigned them by the Creator as well as the same species perform them now. They have attained to their full powers when their physical growth is completed ; but it is not so with man ; he is not bounded in his attainments by the growth of the body ; he goes on improving, even when that is on the decline.

Man is a moral being ; he recognizes a power above him, and feels amenable to its requirements. When he obeys, he feels an emotion of pleasure, and when he disobeys, he experiences pain. On the contrary, beasts have no idea of morality, and can never be trained so as to know the difference between virtue and vice. A dog will serve a thief as faithfully as he will an honest man ; and a horse will not refuse to help a murderer escape from justice.

Man is a being of reflection. He sits down and draws his plans, and reflects upon results, before he puts forth his hand to construct ; and he can always improve upon the first effort. But lower animals do not reflect, nor do they improve by practice.

Many animals, it is true, seem to exercise reason and reflection ; but who supposes the bee reasons and reflects when she is about to construct her comb, as a man does when he is about to rear a splendid edifice ? Who supposes the beaver makes a plan of his dam, before he begins to build it ? or the bird her nest ? In short, who supposes that the duckling, as soon as it is out of the shell, begins to reflect upon his new condition, and say —well, here I am, beside this pool of water, and it must be that I was made to swim in it ; for I am web-footed, and my body seems formed to move in this element ; so I will try my luck upon it ? Or who supposes that the chicken which stands beside this young duck, begins to reason on the same subject and comes to a conclusion directly opposite to that of his web-footed companion, and therefore keeps out of the water ?

Moreover, all the intelligence which an animal ever appears to possess, is confined in its exercise to the support of mere physical existence. It does not go beyond the outward and sensible life, and seems to have been given by the Creator, to aid the possessor in sustaining its present existence. It is satisfied when the demands of the body are supplied ; and it recognizes and desires no other life than the present. The human mind has propensities which are not required to enable man to preserve his life and provide for the wants of his body ; which were bestowed for other and more glorious purposes. It has desires and wants which cannot be satisfied by things of time and sense, desires which continually stretch upward towards a higher life.

Thus the difference between the brute mind, and the human, is as broad and impassable as the great gulf. The former is constituted with only the lowest functions of the animal degree; its manifestations are all of this character, and can never exhibit any thing more. On the other hand, the human mind possesses not only the lowest of the animal degree, but the highest of that degree; and added to this are the degrees of spirit, which have demands not to be satisfied by sensual gratifications; so that man is endowed not only with all the faculties that belong to the animal creation, but with those, also, that belong to the spiritual world. And they seem to have chosen him as a fit temple or dwelling place; consequently he manifests those things which a brute cannot, and which place him infinitely above the highest order of the animal creation.

CHAPTER V.

RESURRECTION OF THE BODY UNREASONABLE.

THE most popular and prevalent view of immortality is doubtless the following: The spirit or soul is immortal, and possesses the element of an eternal continuance of being, and is not dependent on organization, or any combination of matter for existence. At death it goes immediately to the spirit-world, and is there arraigned before the Judge of the universe, tried, and sentenced, according to the deeds which it had done while in the body, either to heaven or to hell, as the case may be; there to remain till the resurrection and judgment, which are to take place at some period yet future, and simultaneously. It will then be rejudged and clothed upon with the same material body which it occupied while dwelling upon the earth, and be sent back to the same place of happiness or misery that held it while in a disembodied state; more, vastly more susceptible of pleasure or pain than it was before the old body was raised from the dust and fastened upon it. A few, perhaps reject that part of this theory which relates to the judgment and retribution; yet, believe that the spirit of man is immortal, and will, immediately after the

death of the body, go to God and remain with Him, in some mysterious way, fill the resurrection ; then it will be united again with the same material body, in which it dwelt while sojourning upon the earth. This body may undergo some change, but, nevertheless, it will still be the same body.

The doctrine of the Resurrection, constituting, as it does, one of the main announcements of Christianity, and connecting itself with the most sacred hopes of the believer, urges its claims upon our profound attention. It is, indeed, a doctrine which is seldom *interrogated*. It is considered, for the most part, as one of those mysterious disclosures which are commended to our naked credence, and about which we are not to indulge a speculative curiosity or to ask prying questions. It is supposed, by the mass of Christians, that we are to regard the Resurrection in no other light than as a simple *fact*, the truth of which we are to receive on the bare authority of the Divine Word, and the accomplishment of which we are to expect solely on the ground of Divine Omnipotence. But is there, indeed, any interdict laid upon inquiry in this department rather than any other? Is the subject fenced about with a balustrading of sanctity, which it is a sacrilege or profanation to attempt to pass through? Must we not, necessarily, submit every position, propounded in revelation, to that intelligence by which alone we can understand it? *Understand* it, we say, for we must understand it, in order to believe it. Let us, then, be apprehended aright. We say that we must understand a proposition, in order to believe it.

We may not, indeed, understand the *mode* in which the asserted fact or truth exists ; the *verbal proposition* affirming it we must understand, or we cannot believe it. That all material bodies gravitate to the earth, is a fact, the *mode* of which I do not by any means comprehend ; but I have no difficulty in understanding the *proposition* which affirms the fact. * * * In like manner, we do not hesitate to assert, that although it may not be possible to comprehend the *mode* in which the resurrection of the body may be brought about, yet I must understand the terms in which the doctrine is announced. In other words, I must be able to affix an intelligible sense to the language employed for that purpose. Yet here is precisely the difficulty in regard to the doctrines as popularly held. We ask for a plain and explicit *statement* of the doctrine. What is the proposition, the belief of which will constitute me a believer in the doctrine of the resurrection of the body ? To one who has not particularly reflected on the subject it might seem that there were no special difficulty on this score, but a closer consideration will probably reveal to multitudes of minds the vagueness and obscurity of their previous conceptions.

Should it be replied, in general terms, to our question, that the truth claiming credence is that the body, which we consign to the dust, is again to be raised and re-animated at some future day ; we rejoice at once, that this reply does not cover the ground of the difficulty. The simple assertion that the dead body is to be raised does not constitute an intelligible

proposition, for the reason that it leaves it utterly uncertain *what body is meant*. * * * * No fact in physiological science is better ascertained than that the human body, in regard to its constituent particles, is in a state of constant flux. It is perpetually undergoing a process of waste and reparation. Strictly speaking, no man has the same body now that he had seven years ago, as it is in about this period that a complete change is held to take place in the bodily structure, by which we may be said to be corporeally renovated. This is a fact established by physiology, and the proof of it, we believe, is entirely beyond question, and must form an indispensable element in any judgment which we pronounce upon the subject. The phrase, *the body*, does not accurately represent the object intended, if the idea conveyed by it be restricted to the body as existing at any one moment. The idea of existence in continuity is indispensable to it. The question, then, again recurs—What body is to be raised? A person who dies at seventy has had ten different bodies. Which of these is to be the body of the resurrection? Is it the body of infancy, of childhood, of youth, of manhood, or of old age? Or is it the aggregate of all these? If we go back to the days of the Antediluvians, and apportion the number of the bodies of Methuselah, for instance, to the length of his life, and then suppose the whole to be collected into one vast corporeity, we should indeed be reminded that, as “there *were* giants in those days,” so there *will be* giants in the day of the resurrection.

It is obvious that a very grave difficulty from this source pertains to the prevalent theory of the resurrection of the body, and one which we discover no mode of obviating on that theory. In the following extracts from "Pearson on the Creed," whose statements of doctrine are, for the most part, singularly luminous, and who has, perhaps, enunciated this doctrine with more explicitness than almost any other writer, it will be seen that his explanation goes, throughout, upon a basis that fails to recognize entirely any such principle of incessant change, in the bodily structure, as a sound physiology forces us to admit. Whether he was not aware of the fact in question, or did not duly appreciate its bearings upon the grand point in debate, we know not ; but it obviously leaves the doctrine open to the full force of an objection, which, as it could not be expected to have occurred to the ancient fathers of the church, would neither be likely to have arrayed itself before the mind of one who was principally occupied in embodying their opinions on the various articles of the Christian creed. "That the same body, not any other, shall be raised to life, which died ; that the same flesh, which was separated from the soul at the day of death, shall be united to the soul at the last day ; that the same tabernacle which was dissolved shall be raised up again ; that the same temple which was destroyed shall be rebuilt, is most apparent out of the same word, most evident upon the same grounds upon which we believe there shall be any resurrection." (Art. xi., p. 568.) So again, in a subsequent paragraph, "We can, therefore, no otherwise expound

this article, teaching *the resurrection of the body*, than by asserting that the bodies, which have lived and died, shall live again after death, and that the same flesh which is corrupted shall be restored ; whatsoever alteration shall be made shall not be of their nature, but of their condition ; not of their substance but of their qualities." So in various other passages he reiterates again and again the assertion, that it is the *same* body that died that is to be raised, and even intimates that this identity is essentially involved in the very term *resurrection*. So that when I say there shall be a resurrection of the dead, I must intend thus much, that the bodies of men which live and are dead shall revive and rise again. For at the death of man nothing falleth but the body, 'the spirit goeth upward,' and no other body falleth but his own ; and therefore the body, and no other but that body, must rise again to make a resurrection. If we look upon it under the notion of reviviscency, which is more ordinary in the Hebrew language, it proves as much, for nothing properly dieth but the body ; the soul cannot be killed ; and nothing can revive but that which dieth. Or, to speak more punctually, the man falleth not in respect of his spirit, but of his flesh ; and therefore he cannot be said to rise again but in respect of his flesh which fell ; man dieth not in reference to his soul, which is immortal, but his body ; and therefore he cannot be said to revive but in reference to his body before deprived of life ; and because no other flesh fell at his death, no other body died but his own, therefore he cannot arise again but in his own flesh, he cannot

revive again but in his own body." (Art. xi. p. 568.)

In all this it is palpable that no regard is had to the physiological objection which we are urging, and which is altogether of too serious a nature to be overlooked in any formal statement of the doctrine; yet the able and excellent bishop, now quoted, tells us that from this "we may easily perceive what every man is obliged to believe, and understood to profess, when he confesseth a belief of *the resurrection of the body*; for thereby he is conceived to declare thus much: I am fully persuaded of this as of a most necessary and infallible truth, that as it is appointed for all men once to die, so is it also determined that all men shall rise from death; that the souls, separated from our bodies, are in the hand of God and live; that the bodies, dissolved into dust or scattered into ashes, shall be re-collected in themselves and re-united to their souls; that the same flesh which lived before shall be revived; that the same numerical bodies which did fall shall rise; that the resuscitation shall be universal, no man excepted, no flesh left in the grave; that all the just shall be raised to a resurrection of life, and all the unjust to a resurrection of damnation; that this shall be performed at the last day, when the trumpet shall sound; and thus I believe **THE RESURRECTION OF THE BODY.**"

But can this be an intelligent belief? What definite ideas can any man attach to the terms in which the doctrine is conveyed? Can any one *believe* in opposition to his positive knowledge? Now we *know*

that the bodies, deposited in the graves, are not the same bodies with those that previously existed in the order of physical succession. If the language above quoted be construed in the utmost strictness of its import, it forces upon us the conclusion, that the identical body, from which the soul took its departure at the hour of death, is the body the particles of which are to be re-collected and re-constructed at the era of the resurrection. But why shall the preference be given to these particular bodies, when, as it is well known, they are often withered and wasted by consumptions, swollen by dropsies, mangled by wounds, made hideous by deformities, curtailed of limbs, or become partially putrid by gangreens? If the material particles of the body are to be re-assembled at all, why not rather suppose that it will be those which composed it in the period of its prime, in its utmost vigor and beauty? But the truth is, the whole theory proceeds upon a fundamental fallacy, which a single glance of the mental eye detects. The resurrection body is to be a *spiritual* and not a material body. The re-assemblage of material particles can result only in the re-construction of a material body, and a material body cannot be at the same time spiritual; at least, we may confidently affirm that the *same material body* cannot be at the same time *spiritual*, although we are aware that St. Paul's expression, "a spiritual body," is understood by some to denote a body *adapted to spiritual uses*, instead of implying one that is metaphysically *spiritual*, in contradistinction from *material*. But, taken in either sense, the asser-

tion above quoted involves contradictory ideas. A material body is a body of flesh and blood ; but "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God."

But, waving all objections on this score, the doctrine of the resurrection of the same body, *in any sense whatever*, encounters difficulties in our view absolutely insuperable, arising from the changes and new combinations which the particles of the dead body undergo in the interval between death and the resurrection. Who does not know that the luxuriant vigor and verdure of the wheat crops, waving over the field of Waterloo, are owing to a source of fertility which the Belgic husbandman never conveyed to the soil ?

Rich harvests wave where mighty Troy once stood,
Birth of a soil made fat by Phrygian blood.

The putrescent relics of the goodly structure which once enshrined a human soul are resolved into the dust of the earth. The dust springs up in the varied forms of vegetable life. The beasts of the field crop the grasses and herbs which derive their succulence from the constituent material of the bodies of buried men. Out of these eaters comes forth sweetness, and the flesh which was fed by the flesh of the fathers goes to the sustenance of the flesh of the sons. To whom shall these particles belong in the day of their final recall from the varied compositions ? Will it not require the whole vegetable and animal world to be decomposed, in order to extricate the assimilated portions and give to each his due ? And how can the matter ever be adjusted ? The particles that now belong to one body have previously belonged to some

other ; whose shall they be in the resurrection?—as the Sadducees asked respecting the wife of seven husbands. And what shall we say of the case of those who have fallen victims to the barbarous rage and horrid hankerings of cannibals? Who shall be the rightful claimants, in the day of adjudication, when specific particles have been incorporated, by perfect assimilation, into two different bodies?

We are aware of the answer which Augustin (*De Civit. Dei*, Lib. xxiv. C. 20,) returns to this form of the objection: "The flesh in question shall be restored to the man in whom it first became human flesh; for it is to be considered as borrowed by the other man, and, like borrowed money, to be returned to him from whom it was taken." But the difficulty is to find the first proprietor. In the endless cycles of change, it is scarcely more the work of imagination than of reason to conceive, that a portion of the matter which once entered into the body of Goliath of Gath may have found its way into Alexander's horse, Bucephalus, from which it might be traced till lodged in the person of some dancing dervish of an eastern city, whirling about in as many antic gyrations as ever did Bucephalus himself, when attempted to be mounted by any one but his royal rider. But suppose the sojourning particles to be traced back to the giant of the Philistines, have we reached their ultimate destination? Whence did he obtain them? May there not have been a prior claimant still? And may not his title be challenged by another still prior, and so on indefinitely? Suppose an individual body, at the

present day, to consist of a million particles; what is easier than to conceive that each of these particles was derived from one of a million bodies that have lived in former ages? If these bodies were each to claim its own, on the ground of the same right which the present possessor has to them, what would be left to *him* from whence to form a resurrection body? But each one of this million of bodies might, perhaps, owe its component particles in like manner to as many predecessors; and we think it a fair question whether, if we were to follow out the supposition to its legitimate results, it would not compel the conclusion, that the whole human race must be resolved back into Adam; and every animal, and every vegetable, back into the first animal and the first plant ever created.

The objection, which constitutes the burden of our present argument, obviously resolves itself into the difficulty of conceiving of any fixed *relation* between the body that dies and the body that is raised. So far as we are able to apprehend the prevalent sentiments of the Christian world in regard to this subject, they suppose that the same body, which is consigned to its native dust, is at some distant day, and in some unknown manner, to be raised again and reconstructed, and the disembodied spirit, after a long exile, to be restored to its primitive habitation, newly fashioned and furnished by the hand of Omnipotence. To this view we urge the objection, that, by the law of animal economy, the body in this life is continually changing, and consequently that it conveys no definite concep-

tion to the mind to say that the body will be raised, unless it is clearly specified what particular body is meant. Nothing is clearer than that the principle above stated enforces the necessary admission of a *succession* of bodies ; and if so, we are at liberty to demand which one of the series is to be raised. If a man retained precisely the same body unchanged from his natal to his dying day, the difficulty would not be so glaringly insurmountable ; but even in that case, as the resurrection body is to be a spiritual body, it confounds our faculties to attempt to imagine of what use the former material and fleshly particles are to be in the formation of a purely spiritual body. Is it not as easy for Omnipotence to form a spiritual body entirely new, without reference to any pre-existing materials, as to elaborate one out of the gross component parts of a previous body ? And is not Mr. Locke's remark, in his letter to Stillingfleet, perfectly well founded, that "it would be hard to determine, if that were demanded, what greater congruity the soul hath with any particles of matter which were once united to it, but are now so no longer, than it hath with particles of matter that were never united to it?"

We repeat, then, that the common view of the resurrection labors, in our opinion, fatally on the score of a conceivable *relation* between the present and future body. Even admitting, as of course we must, that the power of God is competent to form bodies of the same external configuration, but of more glorious texture, and to unite disembodied

souls with them, still the question forces itself upon us—What *relation* exists between the original, putrefied, decomposed and dissipated body, and the sublimated, glorious, incorruptible fabric which is to succeed? what the relations in virtue of which I can call such a body *mine*, and say, “Behold *my* body, raised from the tomb and animated anew!”

We know it is common for poets and poetical declaimers to give loose to imagination, and portray a scene which shall work powerfully on the passions, while at the same time it is as far from scriptural truth as it is from sound philosophy. Thus, in Young’s poem, entitled “The Last Day,” we have the germ of a multitude of similar descriptions, which have been amplified to pages of homiletic declamation; as, for instance, in the sermons of Pres. Davies, and also in one of the eloquent discourses of the Rev. Mr. Melville, of London:—

“Now monuments prove faithful to their trust,
And render back their long committed dust;
Now charnels rattle; scattered limbs, and all
The various bones, obsequious to the call,
Self-moved advance; the neck, perhaps, to meet
The distant head; the distant head the feet;
Dreadful to view, see, through the dusky sky,
Fragments of bodies in confusion fly,
To distant regions journeying, there to claim
Deserted members and complete the frame.”

What shall we say to this? In the view of sober reason, is it any thing but a poet’s dream? And what is the chaff to the wheat? “He that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my

word, let him declare my word." Such descriptions, wrought into pulpit discourses, can be considered as nothing else than pulpit rhapsodising, by which the cause of truth is any thing but a gainer. But this is a view of the subject approaching too near to caricature to be admitted as the *bona fide* belief of sensible men, and as such entitled to serious reflection, and therefore we do not dwell upon it.

But, waving all that can be justly deemed extravagant in the prevailing sentiments on the subject, we still find a large residuum of the improbable and the incredible in that which is propounded to our reception. Guided by the mere *letter* of Scripture, it is common to hear mention made of the body's being raised from the grave, at the sound of the last trumpet, and of its coming out of the tomb or sepulchre in which it was interred. This we concede is Scripture language, and the simple use of the *ipsessema verba* of the Holy Spirit can never be a ground of censure towards any man who uses it with pure motives. Still we are at full liberty to inquire into its meaning, and to institute the most rigid comparison between the literal averments of Holy Writ and the inevitable deductions of our reason, founded upon the ascertained results of science; nor is it possible that the import of the inspired oracles, when rightly understood, should ever be such as to compel us to forego the clear and legitimate conclusions, which are forced upon us by the just exercise of our rational faculties. (The sense, however, which we are constrained to put

upon the *letter* of the Sacred Record, may be different from that which is most natively obvious, and such as would never have occurred to us, but from an apparent conflict between the literal interpretation and the known facts or irresistible inferences derived from other sources — a point upon which we shall have more to say in the sequel.) In the present instance it is unquestionable that the words, quoted from our Saviour's address to the Jews, do encounter a very formidable difficulty arising from the indubitable fact, that thousands and millions of human bodies that were once deposited in graves are not there now, and never will be again. Their tombs are *cenotaphs*, or *empty monuments*, in every sense of the word. Where now are the tenants of hundreds of the cemeteries of Egypt, whose mummy-remains have been from age to age consumed for fuel, or transferred, in the form of medicine, to the jars upon the apothecaries' shelves? They certainly are no longer to be found in the rocky repositories in which they were piously bestowed by the hand of survivors. When our Lord's language, therefore, is applied to cases like these, and it is affirmed that these bodies are to be raised out of their graves at the last day, how is it to be reconciled with the fact now adverted to? Let it not be said that this is an infidel objection, prompted by a proud preference of human reason to the teachings of inspired wisdom. The question is, Is it a *valid* objection? If so, it is entitled to regard, by whomsoever proposed. Nothing is gained by blinking or black-

ening the allegation of real difficulties in any part of the sacred writings.

We do not, of course, urge the objection as bearing at all against the fact of a future existence in another state. But we are at liberty to demand of any one who affirms at this day, respecting a body that was buried, say four thousand years ago, that it is to come out of its burying-place, what he *means* by the assertion, when, in point of fact, not a particle of it remains there—when it has passed partly into other forms of vegetable and animal life, and partly into imponderable gasses. So far as this affirmation builds itself upon the express declaration of Jesus, we would ever interrogate its import with the profoundest reverence; but still we would interrogate it, nor do we conceive that a due respect to the words of inspiration requires us to rest contented with ideas that have nothing in them definite or precise. Under this impression we scruple not to reject, as containing unfair and injurious imputations, the sentiment of the following extract from Witsius, (*Dissert. on the Apos. Creed*, Vol. II. p. 424,) who thus descants upon the philosophical objection we are now urging: “In fact, this objection discovers a preposterous curiosity, and an immoderate love of refinement, which, however, it is not impossible to repress by satisfactory arguments. Even although we could find nothing more particular to say in reply, is it fit that we should bring forward our reason, so feeble, so diseased, so enveloped in thick darkness, and so defiled by numerous corruptions, to

weigh and measure the wisdom and power of God, his faithfulness in his promises, and his admirable providence and incredible facility in removing the greatest possible difficulties? Truly that man cherishes most unworthy thoughts of God, who determines to believe him in nothing but what he is able to investigate and comprehend, in its entire nature and mode, by the force of his own understanding. We make this remark, however, not because we have no other answer to return to the objection ; but because, when human reason replies against God, it is useful again and again to inculcate, that nothing is more just and proper than that, in its inquiries into divine mysteries, it should lay aside all murmurings, and allow itself to be subdued into the obedience of faith." Human reason is undoubtedly required to assume an attitude of the deepest deference and docility in reference to divine teachings, but she can never be required to forego her own attributes in dealing with an alleged revelation from heaven ; and this enjoined subjection to the obedience of faith is often, in truth, little else than a virtual quenching of that candle of the Almighty which he has himself lighted up within us.

But we return to the objection. We say that the *letter* of the inspired record announces a fact apparently at variance with other facts, which carry with them an authority no less imperative to our natural understanding. How can a body come out of the grave that is not there ? It is palpable that the language must be limited, modified, qualified in some

way, in order to be made accordant with known facts. We shall consider the passage more at length in the sequel; but we observe, at present, so far as it is pleaded in proof of the resurrection of the same body, or, indeed, of any material body at all, its testimony necessarily loses its effect, so long as the obvious conflict between the letter and the fact remains unremoved. We are aware it may be replied, that no one can positively affirm that all the dust has disappeared from the place where it was deposited—that some relics of the entombed body may yet remain to form a nucleus of the reconstructed fabric. This we believe to be a very prevalent opinion in regard to the point in question. The dominant impression throughout Christendom is not, we think, that the entire body which was laid down at death is resumed at the resurrection, but rather that certain parts of it, more or less, are in some way preserved from extinction, and, like a germ in vegetation, are transferred from the old to the new structure, between which they constitute the indispensable link in the chain of continuous identity. But to say nothing of the utter lack of evidence that any such transfer takes place—nothing of the intrinsic incompatibility of material and spiritual elements in the same fabric—we are unable to perceive upon what grounds a diminutive portion of a dissolved and discarded human body can be said to constitute that body in its restored state. We can imagine an old house taken down, and a few of its timbers or shingles to enter into the materials of a

new one ; but would this be termed a rebuilding of the former edifice ? So in regard to the former and latter body. The solution labors under an insuperable difficulty, from not defining how much of the one is necessary for rendering it a renewal of the other. We are utterly nonplussed to master the *principle* on which the insertion of a few particles of the former body into the latter shall properly denominate it the resurrection of that body.

The remarks, now made, are made on the admission that there may, in some cases, be a residuum, small though it be, of the corporeal mass remaining in the grave after the lapse of hundreds or thousands of years. The probability, for the most part, we doubt not, would be against this as a matter of fact; but in order to present the difficulty in its strongest light, we will suppose a case about which there can be no doubt. The rights of sepulture — the modes of disposing of the dead — have always been different among different nations ; and of the whole number of the race of man, who have hitherto lived and died, it is very doubtful whether the majority of them have been *buried*, in the ordinary sense of the term. However this may be, we know that *cremation*, or burning, has ever been, and still is, practised among several eastern nations. Now in order to present the difficulty in the case before us in its full strength, we will suppose that, in a sufficient lapse of time, the bodies of five hundred Hindoo widows are consumed on the funeral piles of their husbands, on some lofty mountain peak. In

the process of combustion it is evident, by the laws of chemistry, a considerable portion of the solids and fluids of the system pass into invisible gasses, which are lost in the immensity of the atmosphere, while the only perceptible residuum from each body is a little handful of ashes, which, instead of being gathered up and enclosed in cinerary urns, we will suppose to be scattered by the winds to the four quarters of heaven.

Now it will doubtless be said that these bodies, like all others, are to be raised again at the last day. But what is meant by this language? How — in what sense — are these bodies to be raised? The question is not whether these *persons* are to live again. That is beyond question. But what is to be understood by these *bodies* being said to be raised at the final consummation? Raised out of graves they certainly will not be, for they were never *in* graves; and as to any *germ*, that may possibly be conceived of in respect to inhumed bodies, where is it here? The elements of these bodies, after having been submitted to the action of the fire, are scattered through the universe, and we cannot conceive of any mode by which they can be said to be raised up, except by the re-gathering and re-construction of the dispersed atoms, and to this Omnipotence is undoubtedly competent. But does this relieve the difficulty? Does this bring us to the true scriptural view of the resurrection? Is it the genuine doctrine of the resurrection, that identical particles of the former body are to be re-assembled and

formed into the renovated fabric? Will not this constitute a body of flesh and blood, which we are expressly assured cannot inherit the kingdom of God?

Again then we ask, What is meant by the resurrection of the body, and what *relation* which the body that dies bears to the body that is raised? We cannot convict ourselves of irreverence in proposing these questions. They are forced upon us by the very laws of that reason with which the Creator has endowed us, and with which the dicta of revelation, when rightly understood, *must*, by inevitable necessity, accord. If the announcements of that holy volume can only be received by the surrender of our intelligence, and by a violent suppression of the voice which it utters, how is it ever to command the assent of any but minds of the lowest order?

But we shall, perhaps, be referred to the analogies of the vegetable world, and be reminded of Paul's striking illustration, drawn from the sown seed and the upspringing plant, in which we are to recognize the most fitting emblem of the resurrection. We readily admit the general force of the analogy; but we shall perceive, if we mistake not, on a close examination, that the phenomena of the vegetable world illustrate the subject *in a different way* from what is generally imagined, and favor entirely a different construction. It is well known that throughout the whole kingdom of vegetation, the new plant arises from some inwrapped and latent germ or stamen, to which the vital principle of the plant

adheres, and under the plastic and organic power of which the new plant is developed. If the vital germ of a plant dies, we look in vain for its revival in any form. But when the germ lives, and the conditions are favorable, we confidently anticipate its re-appearance in due season upon the surface of the earth, and its advancement through the several stages of its growth to full maturity, when it will be in the main a fac simile of its parent. But in all this process we can trace the uninterrupted continuance of *life*. - There is no break in the chain of vital operation, and consequently we are not diffculted at all on the score of the *relation* which the new plant bears to the old. Although it undergoes a great change of form, and the numerical particles are in a state of constant transition, yet so long as we can keep our eye on the unbroken thread of *life*, we have no hesitation in saying that there is a consistent sense in which it is the same plant. But suppose that a kernel of corn were planted to-day, in the valley of the Mississippi, where it undergoes the usual process of decomposition, and a century hence, without any removal of the dust, a stalk of corn should spring up on the plains of Hindostan, and we should be told that that was the product of the seed dropped in the soil of the Western continent, could we comprehend the possibility of the fact? Could we perceive the relation of the two? Now this presents very fairly the difficulty in regard to the resurrection of the body. The difficulty arises from the break in the continuity of

the vital operations. While the body is *alive*, the vital functions are indissolubly connected with the presence and functions of the *soul*. When death takes place, the principle, to which the *animation* of the body was owing, departs, and leaves the body a mass of inert, lifeless matter, subject, like all other matter, to the action of chemical agencies, by which it is gradually resolved into its primitive elements. Where, then, do we, or can we, detect any thing like a germ or staminal principle, by the action of which a new body can *ever* be developed out of the remains of the former? It is precisely the case of a plant, the germ of which has been decomposed and destroyed. Does not that plant, as a matter of course, lose its reproductive power? Throw a seed into the fire, and what prospect of its germination? Submit a human body to the flames, and then say whether the effect upon the vital principle, or the vital portion, whatever it may be, is not the same as in the case of the plant. Do not the same natural causes which forbid the quickening of the one forbid that of the other also? This we say on the hypothesis — and it is nothing more — that there is any thing in the human body, apart from the soul, answering to the vital germ of the plant. (But, in truth, the vital principle of the body is indissolubly connected — we do not say identical with the soul.) If the body is again to be animated, it must be by the re-infusion of the soul; a position, in view of which two objections at once array themselves in interrogative form before

the mind:— 1. How is the body to be forthcoming at the appointed time, when it has become blended with an infinity of other organizations, and when different human bodies have an equal claim to the particles composing it? 2. Supposing that Omnipotence should adjust this difficulty, will the re-construction of the original materials of the fleshly body form the spiritual body, which we conceive to be that of the resurrection? And if a change take place virtually equivalent to a new creation, how can this be termed the resurrection of the *same* body? On any ground, therefore, we perceive the immense difficulty of establishing a definite or conceivable *relation* between the body that dies and the body that is raised.

Let us now turn for a moment from the vegetable to the animal kingdom, and note the organisms in that world of wonders. The result we shall find to be the same. We see the grovelling and unsightly caterpillar or silk worm cast off its gross exuvie, and forth issues, after certain ordained transformations, the brisk and beautiful winged insect, soaring upward in an element entirely new, and with a body curiously adapted to the sphere into which its existence is transferred. Though it has not the *same body*, yet we have no hesitation in saying it is the *same creature* which we beheld creeping in peristaltic movement along the ground. And we say it is the same, because we perceive here also the unbroken continuity of the vital principle, the true seat and subject of animal identity. We have no difficulty

in recognizing the *relation* between the primitive and the ultimate organisms. (The one is visibly developed out of the other, without one moment's cessation of the functions of life.) But let us suppose, for a moment, that the caterpillar should die and moulder to dust before this transformation, according to the laws of nature, had taken place; should we look for the emergence, at any future time, of the butterfly from the relics of the grub? Or, if we allow ourselves to imagine that, one hundred or five hundred years after the worm had passed away, an insect should appear, flapping its gilded wings over the very spot where the preceding structure was decomposed, and we should be told that that butterfly was the same being, transformed, with the caterpillar that had perished there ages before, could we by any possibility grasp the ideas involved in the affirmation? All the *relation* that we could discern between the one and the other would be that of *priority and posteriority of time*.

Now this, we contend, is precisely the difficulty that weighs upon the common theory of the resurrection of the body. According to this theory there is just that break — that huge interruption — in the continuous agency of the vital principle, which makes it so impossible to discover or define the *relation* between the buried and beatified body. The latent link which connects the two entirely escapes detection, and yet it is upon the presence of this link alone, that we can predicate *identity* of the two structures. Thousands and millions of bodies per-

ished in the universal deluge. Some of these were probably devoured by the monsters of the deep, and entered into combination with their bodies. Others, after the waters had retired and left them exposed on the surface of the earth, were slowly resolved back again into their primordial elements, and have since passed through countless mutations. The question is, whether the true doctrine of the resurrection requires us to believe that these dispersed materials are to be re-collected again, and to enter into the composition of *spiritual* bodies? If that is the case with the antediluvian dust, it doubtless is with all other; and how this is to be effected, without taking to pieces and unravelling, as it were, the whole framework of Nature, surpasses conception. And if this *is* to be the case, when? Is it to be at the period denominated the last day, when it is for the most part held that the conflagration of the heavens and earth is to take place? If such be unequivocally the divine testimony, we must of course receive it. But it would surely seem to human view, *a priori*, a strange and incomprehensible procedure, that the re-gathering of these scattered particles, the re-building of these dilapidated human temples, should be going on in the midst of this scene of "telluric combustion!"

It is obvious, beyond question, that the popular theory reduces us to great extremities of solution. Indeed, we see not but that the difficulties which cluster about it are absolutely insuperable; and if Faith has only this view of the resurrection to pre-

sent to Philosophy, we cannot perceive any ground for wonder that Philosophy should be slow to receive it ; and yet Philosophy and Faith, like Righteousness and Peace, in the economy of God, are, and must be, wedded together. True philosophy — and we are here speaking of no other — can never — never — be in conflict with true faith.

There is doubtless a great variety of shades in the prevalent belief on this subject ; yet we cannot, we think, be mistaken in regarding it as the general sentiment, that notwithstanding there is a very long and indefinite period to elapse, between death and the resurrection, yet that the future body, when re-produced by the power of Omnipotence, is to be in some way connected with, and raised out of, the existing remains of the corporeal fabric which the soul inhabited during its earthly sojourn. It is probable, indeed, that the views entertained of the nature of this relation are somewhat loose and vague in most minds, and that they rest in resolving it into the working of an Almighty power ; yet that it will be somehow in the actual resurrection, in whole or in part, of the dead bodies consigned to the earth, that this event will be accomplished, is undoubtedly very generally held.

To this view of the received doctrine of the resurrection, we have ventured to suggest the objection drawn from the established fact, that our bodies in this world are undergoing a constant change, from the escape and replacement of the particles of which they are composed, and consequently that, as we

have, in the course of our lives, several bodies, it does not convey a definite or intelligible idea to say that *the body* will be raised at the last day. It leaves us under the irresistible prompting to inquire, what body? It is a mode of expression very similar to that which should affirm of some kind of a coat, which a man has worn for twenty years, that at the end of that time it should be renewed. In ordinary circumstances a person in that period owns and wears out a great many coats. To say, therefore, that at the end of twenty years a man's coat shall be renewed, leaves the mind utterly at loss to know what particular coat is meant. The difficulty is the same in regard to the future renovation of *the body*. What body is intended? The reply dictated by the more prevailing opinion probably is, that it is the *last* body in the series. This is not an unnatural impression, on the basis of the common theory, that the body to be raised is in some way directly related to the body which was laid in the dust. This is certainly the body which dies; and if a new body were to be constructed out of the remains of the old one, it would strike us as most reasonable that it should be out of that which "we saw quietly interred." As the previous bodies have all evaporated and disappeared, the mind doubtless finds it difficult to trace the connexion between these transmitted, volatilised and vanished structures, and the future glorious corporeity. But let us suppose, for a moment — and the supposition is perfectly legitimate — that this last body has just as much disappeared and

become mingled with the universe as any of its Predecessors ; what is gained, we would ask, in the way of meeting the difficulty, by connecting the future raised body with the last of the series, any more than with any of the former ones ? In the space of some thousands of years they have all of them equally disappeared, and for aught that we can see, one of them has just as much relation to the future resurrection body as an other — *and just as little*. Indeed, we may ask, if it is possible for any man, in the exercise of his calm reflection, even by the utmost stretch of his faculties, to conceive the possibility that a risen saint should be able to recognize the splendid, sublimated, celestial fabric, in which he soars upwards to the eternal mansions, as specifically related to that worn, wasted, withered, decrepit, or possibly marred, mutilated, and deformed body from which his soul took its exit ? For ourselves, we are unable to discover any adequate grounds for this opinion, or to realise that the objection we are urging, from the successive changes of the human body, is not a valid objection. We are certainly at liberty to demand what particular body is to be raised ; if any one is specified, then we ask why that rather than any other ? If it be replied that the aggregate of the whole is to be raised, we naturally ask how those portions of the huge fabric are to be disposed of, which have equally belonged to other bodies ?

Our grand objection, then, to the common theory of the resurrection, is founded upon the lack of a

conceivable *relation* between the former and the latter bodies. This relation we do not hesitate to affirm to be beyond the grasp of the human intellect, and a resort to Omnipotence leaves the difficulty, in our view, just where it was before. While we would not dare to limit the Holy One of Israel, or deny that any thing is possible to him which is possible in itself, yet, as we apprehend the subject before us, the ideas involved in the proposition of the resurrection of the same body are incompatible *per se*. The real question is, how Omnipotence itself can establish the relation of which we are in quest—how, not as to the *manner*, but as to the *fact*.

We are aware it is easily replied, it is no more difficult to conceive of the future body being built up out of the dispersed particles of the old one, than it is to conceive of the *creation* of the body in the first instance. But this reply loses sight of one important consideration, which destroys the parallelism of the two cases. In the original creation there is the production of something, by the simple fiat of Omnipotence, that has no relation to any thing going before. But in the case of the resurrection there is the production of something out of a pre-existing substance, and consequently involving a *relation* of the former and latter fabric to each other, which is of such a nature as utterly to confound and overwhelm our faculties, even when Omnipotence is called in to solve the problem. We may illustrate the difficulty that cleaves to the hypothesis by a fresh supposition. We can easily imagine that,

beneath the surface of a field of battle, a human body, the body of a horse, and the wheel of a war-chariot may have been buried together. In process of time all these substances moulder away and become one indiscriminate mass of dust. The dust is there ; but still it is but dust, and no power of human thought can conceive of one part of the earthy material being essentially different from the rest. No one can imagine any superior adaptedness, in one part more than in any other, for the construction of a glorified body. It is certainly impossible to conceive that any attributes should pertain to one portion of the mass, which should enable the soul to recognize itself as more *at home* in a body formed of that, than in one formed of any other.

Yet if the popular view of the subject be correct, we are required to believe that there is a discrimination to be made between these particles, now become homogeneous, and that a latent virtue in some, which does not pertain to the others, is to appropriate them to the formation of a body "fashioned like unto Christ's glorious body." Can we conceive it? If it be said, in reply, that the true question is, not whether we can conceive it, but whether inspiration has affirmed it, our rejoinder to this will be found in the sequel, where we consider the scriptural argument.

CHAPTER VI.

THE IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL.

THERE are some learned and worthy individuals, who deny the immortality of the soul, yet believe that all men are heirs of immortality. They contend that man will sink into a state of unconsciousness at death, and remain so, till the general resurrection, when the whole human family shall awake simultaneously, as it were, from a deep sleep, and go forth to enjoy a life immortal. But is this true? Is there a space between death and the resurrection, in which the soul has no conscious existence? To answer this, and to develop the doctrine of the future life, according to reason and revelation, is the object of this chapter.

In going back among the records of the past, both sacred and profane, one of the first things to arrest attention is the doctrine itself, that the soul dies not, but continues beyond this life. From the earliest ages of the Hebrew commonwealth, an impression prevailed among that people, more or less definite, that the dead, after their departure to the unseen world, retain a conscious existence. Something of this may have been learned from

Egyptian psychology ; but it is probable that, even before the sojourn in Egypt, the family of Abraham, in common with the original inhabitants of Canaan, had some conviction of a continued existence after death. The researches and investigations of the learned, have served to show that such an impression has prevailed over the world, from the remotest antiquity, and in the rudest and most uncultivated states of society. Egypt, with her sacred and secular philosophers, is said to have the honor of first teaching the immortality of the soul. The mystic religion of her priesthood, which promised glory and immortality, was beautiful and attractive, as it broke upon the mind through the drapery of its solemn rites. But the question of the soul's *immortality* evidently belongs to a later age than that of its mere *continued existence*. While the former was unknown, and unrecognized in the Sacred Records, the latter was a common faith. No where does history bring the account of any nation or people of antiquity, who have not had some conceptions of a life beyond the present.

The question, then, becomes extremely interesting, both in itself and in its bearings on the point under discussion, — Whence was this impression derived? It has been maintained by some, that this, as well as other points of theological knowledge, was derived from early revelations made to the human race, and diffused by tradition through all nations. The different forms in which it has appeared in different ages and nations, are supposed

to be corruptions of the original idea. But as there is no record of such revelations, and no evidence except conjecture, of their transmission among different nations, the theory may be dismissed without further remark. Others have assumed that the idea of a continued life was a pure invention of impostors, who designed thereby to exert an influence over the public mind. Of this, however, there is no proof. And such a theory, destitute of evidence to sustain it, is wholly insufficient to account for the conception and prevalence of the idea among nations remote from each other. Were there any priests or impostors among the original inhabitants of this continent, to invent and perpetuate the notions of the future life? On most of the different islands which have been discovered in distant and remote oceans, the inhabitants have been found entertaining the same general notion of a continued existence beyond death. Has this sprung from imposture? It is not surprising that impostors should have caught an already prevailing impression, invested it with their own sombre drapery, and then made use of it for sinister purposes. Nor is it surprising that fear and guilt should have incorporated many errors with such an impression. From these emotions of the diseased mind, together with the prevailing idea of a future life, has, doubtless, arisen the errors of endless rewards and punishments. But these are corruptions and abuses that spring from human depravity, and are utterly insufficient to account for the existence and general prevalence of the original idea itself. Whence, then, has it originated?

May it not be inferred that God himself has dimly impressed it upon the human mind? or that he has caused it to spring up naturally, in some faint glimmerings, from the peculiar mental and moral constitution which he has given to man?

Most philosophers are ready to admit that there are certain intuitive principles of belief, called *first truths*, which spring up spontaneously in all minds. These are not susceptible of proof, because they stand behind and form the beginnings of all our processes of reasoning. "They admit of no other evidence than an appeal to the consciousness of every man, that he does, and must, believe them."* "It is impossible to doubt them, because to disbelieve them would be to deny what our very constitution was formed to admit."† Among these fundamental truths, must be ranked "a conviction of our own existence as sentient and thinking beings; and of mind, as something distinct from the functions of the body. From the first exercise of perception, we acquire a knowledge of two things; namely, the thing perceived, and the sentient being who perceives it. In the same manner, from the exercise of any mental operation, such as memory, we acquire an impression of the thing remembered, of an essence or principle which remembers it, and of this essence as something entirely distinct from any function of the body."‡ And this intuitive conviction is universal. No one

* Abercrombie.

† Brown. *Lecture on Mental Phil.*, vol. 1, p. 127.

‡ Abercrombie on *Intellectual Powers*, p. 157.

can reflect upon his own body, without recognizing a principle within, distinct from it, which thinks, perceives, reasons, and examines into its organs and their various functions.

With such an impression growing out of the very constitution of human nature, it was quite natural for people to suppose mind might exist in a state separate from the body. Doubtless, at a very early age of the world, they began to look upon the body as a mere tenement for the soul. And they would readily imagine that the tenant might leave its dwelling-place without dissolution, and, perhaps, without inconvenience. (Is not this the origin of the psychological error of metempsychosis?) The conception that soul exists, as an essence distinct from bodily organization, must, almost of necessity, lead to the associated idea of its continued existence when the body is dissolved.

Nor can it be doubted that this conviction is the foundation of all our conceptions of a Supreme Being. We say very justly, that nature proves the existence of its Author. But what is the first step in the process of reasoning—the very corner stone on which the whole structure is based? Is it not the consciousness which we have of mind, or soul, in ourselves? Before all reasoning, there must be some conception of a mental or spiritual being. Unless we fall into actual anthropomorphism, we must derive our primary idea of a Deity from the conception which we have of mind, or spirit, in ourselves. Having once formed the idea of mind, as an essence

distinct from matter, it is easy to apply that idea to beings out of ourselves, and then to enlarge and perfect it, until we conceive of a God with infinite and absolute perfections.* And this was unquestionably the mode in which men first began to form a conception of superior beings. In the rude ages of the world, they saw all things in motion, and, unable otherwise to account for the cause of such motion, they ascribed it to mind existing in the objects. They were conscious of mind as the cause of their own movements, and naturally supposed that a similar principle resided in all moving objects as the cause of *their* motion.† Thus they drew from nature the evidence of a great Divine Mind. But, through ignorance, they were unable to confine themselves to *one* being as supreme. The original idea of mind or spirit in themselves, was perverted, and made the foundation not only of polytheism and idolatry, but of all the psychological vagaries that have prevailed in the world. Inanimate objects have been endowed with soul or intelligence, and then worshiped as divine. And the idea of human souls, as existing distinct from body, and continuing beyond death, has been encumbered with innumerable errors, which have lessened its value, and sometimes rendered it suspected. It is not wonderful that truth corrupted should be lost sight of; it then becomes error. Nor is it wonderful that the fanciful theories, which have been

* Tholuck on the Origin of Heathenism, Bib. Repos., vol. 2, p. 86.

† See Bergier. Dic. de Thol., Art. Idolatry.

advanced concerning the soul, should have led some to doubt its existence beyond death. The whims and speculations of false philosophy, on the one hand, have naturally driven some minds into doubt and disbelief on the other. But between these extremes there is a middle ground — an important truth which God has fitted men to receive. “By nature,” says Cicero, “we are led to the belief that the gods exist; but what they are, we learn by an exercise of reason; so by the consent of all nations, we believe that souls continue beyond this life; but what they are, and in what condition they will remain, must be learned by reason.”* Is not this latter conviction the result of man’s natural constitution, as well as the former? The consent of all nations is but an evidence that God has placed this conviction on the same ground as that of his own existence. It may not have the same strength and permanence, but it proceeds from the same general principles.

Such, then, is the origin of the notion, so extensively prevailing, of some sort of existence beyond the present. But without the light of Revelation, it could not be expected to escape corruptions. Indeed, it was the very thing to open an avenue for human credulity, fear, guilt, and curiosity, to bring in their fanciful theories. The idea itself, disconnected with all errors, is very simple, embracing merely the conviction of a spirit in man that continues beyond death, without any definite notion as to its nature and con-

* *Tusc. Q.*, lib. de *Contemnenda Morte*.

dition. All beyond this conviction was conjecture ; even immortality was enigmatical. But conjecture was rife with its theories respecting souls, and their future condition — respecting angels and spirits, both good and evil, and their influence over men — and respecting the intercourse of souls in the body with spirits departed. Hence arose the magic arts of antiquity — hence the belief in divination and necromancy, and the reverence for magicians, enchanters, witches, consultants of familiar spirits, and other classes, who, it was thought, could evoke and hold communion with the shadowy forms of unearthly beings.* The references, in the books of Moses, to these prevailing impressions, and the decided condemnation of magic, witchcraft, necromancy, and every form of divination, show plainly enough, that the Jews, at the very commencement of their commonwealth, had imbibed the same errors. It cannot be denied that they had some conceptions of disembodied beings — some faith in spirits in another world. They surely believed in angels and other spiritual existences. In close connection with the soul's continuance in a conscious state, they had formed the notion, in common with the neighboring nations, of a sort of subterranean world, the residence of departed spirits. Few will dispute that such a notion was entertained by the early Hebrews. *Sheol* was regarded a sort of shadowy world, where the *manes* of the departed formed a vast congregation in conscious existence. This opinion

* Jahn, *Archæology*, § 314.

distinctly assumed the doctrine of a continuance of souls, or of being, beyond this life.

Was this doctrine recognized in the Jewish Scriptures, especially in the five books of Moses? There are certainly indications in the writings of the Jewish lawgiver, not only that the doctrine prevailed among the people, but that it was recognized as a divine truth. Are there not some principles of revelation assumed in the Sacred Records, or taken for granted as true, without being directly and didactically asserted? It is, for instance, nowhere said by way of original revelation, in the writings of Moses, that "there is a God," but that affirmation is everywhere assumed as a well established and generally admitted truth. "In the beginning, God created the heavens and the earth." (Gen. 1: 1.) Here, as elsewhere, there is a direct affirmation that God performed something; but no attempt to prove, or even to reveal that he exists. When he appeared to Moses in the burning bush, the historian constantly assumes, without asserting, the fact of his being. On this occasion he declared himself the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob; but Moses merely asked his name, without demanding any assertion of his existence or supremacy. Moses, however, was very particular in correcting the errors which the Jews might have gathered from Egypt and elsewhere, concerning the nature and character of God. Especially does he direct his institutions against idolatry. Monotheism, in contradistinction from the prevailing forms of polytheism, is very often asserted by the Jewish lawgiver. "Hear, O Israel, the Lord thy God

is one Lord" — not many. (Deut. 6 : 4.) "I" — and no one else of all the tutelary deities of the age and country — "I am the Lord thy God, that brought thee out of Egypt." (Exodus 20 : 1.) "Thou shalt have no other gods before me." Thus was Moses very cautious in correcting the great and prominent errors of the people ; but, if I mistake not, he nowhere affirms, or denies, that the one God exists. Still, the mode in which he refers to this Being is a sufficient recognition of his existence ; and that recognition, therefore, becomes a truth of revelation.

Is not the existence of angels, or an order of beings superior to the human race, recognized in the same way ? Every one knows that mention is very often made, in the Holy Scriptures, of "angels," "his angel," "the angel of the Lord," and "the angel of God." And no one can doubt that, in some instances, these phrases denote some sort of personal beings or agents, superior to men, and of a spiritual nature. The prevailing belief of the early Hebrews is clearly indicated in the record of Jacob's dream, (Gen., 28 : 12.) It has indeed been maintained by some that the phrase, "angel of the Lord," refers to Christ, as the second person in the Trinity.* Others, however, have affirmed that it denotes a peculiar manifestation of the divine presence (especially in Genesis 16 : 7, *et seq.*) to the various persons mentioned.† But this, with other similar phrases, is evidently applied more frequently to a superior order of beings, of whom the

* Hengstenberg's Christology. See Bib. Repos., vol. 3, p. 653.

† Stuart's Heb. Chrestomathy, p. 167.

apostle says, "They are all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation."* Yet it is nowhere directly asserted that such an order of beings exist. Their existence is assumed as a well known fact. The prevailing opinion is recognized; and as there is no condemnation of it, in any part of the Sacred Record, it becomes a truth of revelation. If it were condemned in any part of the Divine Word, although mentioned in other parts in a way to imply its reality, it could not be regarded as a revealed truth.

It is on this ground that the doctrine of evil angels is exploded, as an erroneous theory. If I mistake not, the book of Job was designed as a direct condemnation of an opinion prevailing among the people, concerning the agency of evil angels in the affairs of man. At any rate, the apostle Paul declares, (1 Tim. 4: 1) that "in the last times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils" — "or, rather, giving heed to erroneous spirits and doctrines concerning demons."† In mentioning this declension, he evidently condemns the doctrine concerning demons, which had prevailed in the world. The true principles of revelation do not embrace that doctrine. In this condemnation is embraced the whole system of Jewish demonology. Their opinions concerning *Diabolos*, *Samael*, and *Satan*, as well as *Daimonia*, are alike condemned.

* Bush, Notes on Genesis, 16. 7.

† Newton on the Prophecies, vol. 2, p. 82.

And hence, though the sacred writers often mention these in adaptation to common opinions and prejudices, it is not to be supposed that they are recognized as beings really existing in a sort of spiritual state. But while all such errors are clearly condemned, the existence of an order of superhuman beings — holy angels — is taken for granted, as true, with no subsequent condemnation.

Do not these remarks apply, with equal force, to the scriptural recognition of the soul as a distinct entity, and its continued existence after leaving the body? No one can dispute that this was an article of common belief among the Jews, from the commencement of their theocracy. Testimony the most conclusive, on this point, is to be found in the numerous scriptural references to witchcraft and necromancy, and in the severe laws enacted against them. Such laws would not have been enacted against necromancy, if that superstitious practice had not prevailed to an alarming extent among the people. Yet necromancy presupposes a belief that the spirits, or souls of the dead, continue in a conscious state of existence. The interview of Saul, with the witch of Endor, does not prove that Samuel's spirit still existed in a conscious state; but it does prove the prevalence of a common faith to that effect.*

* Bishop Warburton (*Divine Legation*, book v., §5) contends that the doctrine of a future state was not taught in the writings and institutions of Moses, and that it seems not to have had any share in the people's thoughts; and yet he admits, (book vi.) that the patriarchs had some faith in it, which they derived from God's promises, contained in the Mosaic writings. Some of his assertions are singular and extravagant. No one can read

Was this common faith anywhere condemned by the commissioned lawgiver of the Jews? It is corrected; but is it condemned in any part of the Sacred Writings? It will be difficult to find a passage condemning the naked principle, which forms so important a feature of the revelations of Christianity. It will be seen, hereafter, that Christ and his apostles taught the doctrine of a continued existence of the spirit beyond this life. And it cannot be supposed that any revelation made to mankind has condemned, as falsehood, a principle which Christianity recognizes as a fundamental truth. But though neither Moses, nor any other sacred writer, has condemned the belief that souls exist beyond this life, yet he has enacted severe laws against the various abuses of it. It was a striking feature of the legal dispensation to correct the errors of the people, and prepare them for the reception of truth. Moses was well aware of the errors which they had acquired in Egypt, and to which they would be exposed by their contiguity with the Canaanites and other nations. Consequently he enacted the following ordinance, (Deut. 18: 9 — 12;) “When thou art come into the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee, thou shalt not learn to do after the abominations of those nations; there shall not be found among you any one that maketh his son or his daughter to pass through the fire, or that useth divina-

the accounts of Jewish necromancy, without admitting that the people thought of a future life. Moses did not, indeed, directly *assert* the doctrine; but he has used language which surely implies some sort of life beyond the present state of being.

tion, or an observer of times, or an enchanter, or a witch, or a charmer, or a consulter with familiar spirits, or a wizard, or a necromancer. For all that do these things are an abomination unto the Lord." This divine ordinance assumes the prevalence, among the Canaanites, of the superstitious practices therein condemned. These are called "an abomination unto the Lord." The Israelites were forbidden to "do after the abominations of those nations," and were assured that, in consequence of the practice of them, the Lord would expel the original inhabitants from Canaan, and give that land as an inheritance to his chosen people. But many of these abominations sprang from abuses of the conviction that souls exist after their bodies are dissolved, and could not have been practised without such conviction. While, however, the abominations and malpractices were prohibited, the conviction itself was passed over in virtual approval, or at least without condemnation. By this course, the sacred writer, without distinctly affirming the doctrine that souls exist longer than the body, did at least give it some countenance and support.

It is not, however, a mere negative acknowledgment, which it receives in the Pentateuch, and other books of the Old Testament. It is more directly and positively recognized in them. It is true that Moses does not speak in direct and decisive language concerning the future state—the existence of human spirits beyond their earthly abode. The references which he makes to this subject are only brief hints, intelligible, perhaps, to those alone to whom a knowl-

edge of it would be essentially beneficial.* He did not inculcate the *immortality* of the soul, except so far as immortality might be inferred from its continued existence after leaving the body. But, as will be seen in the sequel, he does very plainly *assume* that mind, or spirit, does not die, when its connection with the physical frame is dissolved. Several considerations from "Moses and the prophets" may be brought to show that there is something in man, soul or spirit, which lives beyond the dissolution of the body.

1. The idea is inculcated in all those passages which speak of the dead as "going to their fathers," as "sleeping with their fathers," &c. The ancient Hebrews regarded life as a journey, or a pilgrimage, which terminated at death; when the sojourner entered into the company of his ancestors.† Hence it is said of Ishmael, that having lived an hundred and thirty-seven years, "he gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered to his fathers." (Gen. 25: 17.) Abraham, also, "gave up the ghost and died in a good old age, an old man and full of years, and was gathered to his people." (Gen. 25: 8.) Of a similar import is the language used in reference to Isaac's death: "He gave up the ghost, and died, and was gathered to his people, being old and full of days. And Esau and Jacob buried him." (Gen. 35: 29.) Concerning Rachel, the language is peculiar: "And it came to pass, as her *soul was in departing*, (for

* Hengstenberg's *Christ*, vol. 1, p. 35. Warburton, *Divine Legation*, book vi., § 5.

† Jahn, *Bib. Archaeology*, § 203.

she died,) that she called his name Benoni." (Gen. 35: 18.) In all these passages, there is an evident intention to convey the idea that some sort of essence, or being, existing in the body, was departing from it; and yet that it lived, after its departure, to be gathered to the assembly of those who had gone before it. This being is not the body, and not the *breath* of life. It is that which constitutes personal identity — that to which the pronouns, *I, thou, me, he, self*, and others, are appropriately applied. It may, indeed, be said that the expressions, in passages above mentioned, are poetic figures, designed to convey the idea of natural death, without intimating anything beyond. This explanation would be satisfactory, if there had been no previous conviction of the continued existence of the soul after leaving the body. But with such a belief, which the patriarchs unquestionably entertained, in common with the Jews generally, the language could not be used without conveying the idea of spirit, or something else, departing from its temple, and still existing in a conscious state after death. Indeed, the imagery was evidently borrowed from the current belief of the age — a belief, which Moses, so far from condemning, has, in its essential features, virtually approved.

It is not to be supposed that being "gathered to their fathers," denotes a particular ancestral burial-place. When the promise was made to Abraham, "Thou shalt go to thy fathers in peace; thou shalt be buried in a good old age," (Gen. 15: 15,) it was not certainly intended that his body should be laid by the

graves of his ancestors ; for he was buried in a cave near the plain of Mamre, at the south of Hebron. But his fathers lived, and died, and were buried, in the extensive country of the Chaldeans, beyond the Euphrates. The meaning of the promise, then, is that he should be gathered to the vast congregation of his departed ancestors, who were conceived of as yet alive and conscious of their condition. "When persons are said to go to their fathers, and go down to their children who were dead, nothing more seems to be meant than that they had gone to *Sheol* or *Hades*, where all the dead are represented as one vast congregation."* With these prevailing opinions, the Jews must, of necessity, conceive of that congregation as living in their unearthly state. The phraseology used with reference to it, was directly calculated to confirm the conviction of a conscious existence of human spirits beyond this life.

The figure of a sleep, made use of to denote death, would naturally add further confirmation of the prevailing belief. "The Lord said unto Moses, Behold, thou shalt sleep with thy fathers." (Deut. 31 : 16.) And the death of several kings of Israel is recorded in the simple but pathetic language, "He slept with his fathers."† Sometimes the expression is varied by adding, "And they buried him in the city of David," or, "He was buried with his fathers, in the city of David." This, it will be admitted, is a beautiful

* Balfour's *Essays*, p. 15.

† See 1 Kings, 2: 10; 11: 21, 43; 14: 20, 31; 15: 8, 24; 2 Kings, 8: 24; 13: 9; 15: 7; 2 Chron. 27: 9; 32: 33; 28: 27; 33: 20.

figure to express a naturally repulsive and gloomy fact. It conveys the idea of rest and peacefulness, and at the same time indicates a continued existence. The being who sleeps is not wholly dead, but reposing in slumber, from which he shall again awake. The language, then, was calculated to strengthen the conviction that mind, or person, or the being who thinks, was not annihilated at death; that, though he slept or rested in the land of darkness and forgetfulness; though he was gathered to the assembly of the dwellers in *Sheol*; yet he was still capable of thought and perception, of sympathy and affection. There was a degree of tenderness associated with this conviction, that rendered it the more pleasant and permanent. And perhaps it was strengthened by the impossibility of conceiving of beings annihilated. No man can conceive of himself as non-existent. When he makes the attempt, he invariably conceives of a being existing; and he vainly endeavors to associate, with this conception, the idea of absolute nothingness, and to include himself, or any other being, in that idea. He remembers his friends who have died; but the remembrance always includes the idea of living beings, either active or at rest. He conceives of them as they were when alive; and he cannot bring his thoughts down to the present, and conceive of them as gone, without carrying along with that conception the idea of their existence. The memories of the past necessarily embrace and convey to the present the living images of beings then existing and acting. It is this circumstance, perhaps, more than any thing else,

which has strengthened the conviction that the dead are not annihilated ; but, though taken from us, that they still exist, in some mysterious region beyond the grave.

2. The Jewish views of *Sheol*, and the scriptural references to that subject, afford further evidence of an intention of the sacred writers to recognize the existence of the spirit after leaving the body. It cannot be questioned that *Sheol*, in the Old Testament, primarily denotes a dim region beneath the face of the earth—a world for the dead in general, without reference to their moral qualities, their happiness or misery. 'The uniform testimony of ancient and modern *savans* has fully established this as the meaning of the word.* It is derived from a root, (*shaal*,) which has "the import of craving, requiring, insatiable longing, from its being one of the four things which, Solomon says, are never satisfied."† It is translated *grave*, *pit*, and *hell*; but there is as wide a departure from the truth on the one hand, in assuming that it denotes merely the resting-place of the body, "exclusively the grave or place of burial,"‡ as there is, on the other, in maintaining that it denotes a state of punishment beyond this life. It was doubtless designed to express the rendezvous of the dead — a sort of underworld, where the spirits, or attenuated forms and shadowy images of the departed, were congregated in

* See Stuart's *Essays*, p. 98 ; Campbell's *Four Gospels*, vol. 1, p. 180 ; Balfour, *First Inquiry*, chap. 1.

† Bush, *Notes on Genesis*, 37 : 35.

‡ *Universalist Quarterly*, vol. 1, p. 367.

a state of conscious existence.* What we are able to learn of Jewish opinions shows conclusively that this people believed in the existence of spirits after death. In barbarous ages, they would naturally conceive of some locality for the residence of departed souls. And when this idea was once established, they would as naturally find a word to express it. Such a word they have in the Hebrew tongue — the word *Sheol*. “The popular notion was, that *Sheol* was a deep region in the earth where the ghosts of the dead all resided.”† The belief of the ancient Hebrews was, that the spirits of the dead were received into *Sheol*, which is represented as a large subterranean abode.”‡ But they could have no sort of belief or notion of the residence of such unearthly images, without conceiving of them as *existing*, and conscious of their existence in that region.

With such a word in common use, and such a meaning conveyed by it, who can believe it possible for the sacred writers to employ it without recalling to the minds of the people their old convictions — without suggesting the idea of human souls, or spirits, existing in *Sheol*? In what way do they employ the word, and how do they appear to have been understood?

The first place where *Sheol* is used in the Bible, if I am not mistaken, is Genesis 37 : 35, where Jacob, mourning for Joseph, refused to be comforted and said, “For I will go down into the grave (*Sheol*) unto

* Mr. Balfour denies that the dead were conscious in *Sheol*; but it is certain that the people conceived of them as *existing* and conscious, and used the word to express that idea.

† Balfour, *First Inquiry*, p. 56. ‡ Jahn, *Bib. Archæology*, § 314.

my son mourning." It was but a little while before, (Gen. 35 : 20,) that the historian, recording the death and burial of Rachel, made use of another word (*keber*) to denote her grave, or burial-place. It was evidently something different that he wished to express by the word *Sheol*. The aged mourner believed that his son rested in that mysterious and dimly disclosed existence ; and, however sad the reflection, yet, in his sorrow, he desired to go down and join him there. Can it be supposed that he regarded him as utterly unconscious of any existence ? His very wish to go down unto him, indicates his conviction that *Sheol* contained the living spirit, or *effigiem*, of his departed son. There are a few other passages where *Sheol* is used with reference to the death of Jacob, and doubtless with its common signification.* Do they not contain a recognition of something in man that continues to exist after death ? The holy Scriptures do not sanction any errors respecting *Sheol* and its inhabitants, connected with this conviction. All errors are corrected, and the truth alone, respecting the soul's continuance, is sanctioned by the later revelations of Christianity.

It is not necessary to examine all the passages where *Sheol* occurs in the Old Testament. The word is often used figuratively, sometimes to denote the sepulchre, but oftener, perhaps, to signify some peculiar state of the people in this world. Still its prevailing usage clearly indicates an invisible world for the shades or spirits of the dead. Thus in 1 Sam. 2 : 6, "The

* Gen. 44 : 29, 31 ; 42 : 38.

Lord killeth and maketh alive ; he bringeth down to the grave, (*Sheol*,) and he bringeth up." The very language here employed assumes the continued existence of the thing brought down to *Sheol*, and brought up again. So when Job says, "O that thou wouldst hide me in the grave," (*Sheol*,) considering the prevalent meaning of the word, he could not have used it without referring to an invisible region where he hoped to be at rest, yet conscious of his quiet.

But this idea is confirmed by another class of texts, which contain the Hebrew word *rephaim* in connection with *Sheol*. According to Gesenius, this word in the singular, (*rapha*,) signifies "*beings relaxed, feeble, languid ;*" and in the plural, (*rephaim*,) denotes "*the weak,*" and designates "*the manes or shades dwelling in Hades, whom the Hebrews supposed to be destitute of blood and animal life, and, therefore, weak and languid, like a sick person ; but not wholly without some faculties of the mind.*" Poetical imagery has given life and animation to the dwellers in *Sheol*, and invested them with the costumes of the living. Poetry, however, is but an echo of prevailing tastes and opinions. These, then, are the creative power which, out of a fundamental truth, have constructed the attenuated forms or manes of the departed. And does not inspiration, by its very reference to the poetic creations, sanction the fundamental truth? Amid the drapery of *rephaim* and *Sheol*, with which the sacred writers have invested their thoughts, do they not recognize the continued existence of the soul beyond this life, out of which the

poetic fictions have sprung? There is seldom a fiction that has not some reality for its foundation. The fictions concerning Sheol and its inhabitants must have had their groundwork in a primary truth, which truth is confirmed by the very prevalence of the fictions.

Among the texts referred to is the passage in Job 26: 5, 6 —

“Before him the *shades* beneath tremble,
The waters and their inhabitants;
The underworld is naked before thee;
Destruction is without a covering.”*

Whether the representation here were fiction or reality, it must necessarily confirm a superstitious people in their convictions relative to *Sheol* and the “*shades*,” (*rephaim*), and it seems designed to sanction the great truth that lay at the bottom of them. A further recognition of the same truth is found in the language of the Psalmist, (Ps. 88: 10, 11,) when the questions are asked implying the strongest negations, “Wilt thou show wonders to the dead (*metim*?) Shall the dead (*rephaim*) arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, (*keber*?)” Here the *dead* mentioned in the first interrogation are very different from the *rephaim* in the second. In the third, *keber* is used, denoting grave in a sense different from *Sheol*. While, then, the dead (*metim*) in the first question denotes dead bodies, *rephaim* in the second must have been designed to express the souls or *manes* of the departed, the supposed living residents of *Sheol*. There is another

* See Noyes' Translation of Job.

passage to the same effect, in the prophecy of Isaiah, (14: 9.) "Hell from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming. It stirreth up the dead (*rephaim*) for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth. It hath raised from their thrones all the kings of the nations." The prophet, in this connection, was predicting the fall of the Babylonian empire, and the deliverance of the Jews from their long captivity. The king of Babylon, addressed as "Lucifer, son of the morning," was to experience a terrible humiliation and death. So great was the victim to be received into *Sheol*, among its spectral inhabitants, that *Sheol* itself was moved at his coming, and the dead, *rephaim*, ghosts, or *umbræ* of earth's mighty departed, were disquieted at his presence.* But however figurative this passage may be, and whatever errors its literal interpretation may involve, it certainly adds another to the numerous scriptural evidences that *Sheol* was regarded as the receptacle of the spirits of departed men, which were alive and conscious in their unearthly abode. The errors connected with this opinion are corrected by the clearer light of the Christian revelation; but this correction does not presuppose that the opinion itself is wholly false in all its parts. The continued existence of the soul, so clearly recognized in this passage, is fully affirmed by Christ and his apostles as a truth from God.

There are some other passages belonging to the same class, which it is not necessary to quote at length. They set forth not only a world for the dead, but the

* See Lowth's Translation of Isaiah, p. 216.

dead also as having life, consciousness, and shadowy forms in that world. And however erroneous may be the representations, there is evidently an important truth lying at the bottom of them, which forms a part of revelation, namely, the conscious existence of mind, or soul, in some condition beyond this life.

3. Another evidence of the same truth, in the Old Testament, is derived from the use of the words which are rendered life, breath, soul, and spirit; namely, *nephish*, *ruah*, and others. All these, in their primary meaning, seem to have some reference to air or breath; and were, probably, first applied to animated beings, in consequence of the movement of air that was observed during the act of respiration. But they were subsequently employed with almost every variety of analogous signification, denoting life, breath, wind, passions, emotions, persons, self, mind and spirit.* No one can doubt that they are sometimes used to denote the mind, its faculties and affections, as distinguished from the body. But their more common signification is animal life, the vital principle or sensitive soul, common alike to man and beast.

It has already been shown that the Jews, in early times, had some conception of a rational spirit distinct from the human body. As this conception ripened into a conviction, and prevailed extensively among the people, it was very natural for them to find some word to express it. But the subject, in its more recondite relations, was not to be comprehended without difficulty. It is not surprising, therefore, that man-

* See *The Soul, or Scriptural Psychology*, by Prof. Bush.

kind, in the rudest ages, should have had but an imperfect idea of the nature and properties of the soul. Their knowledge of it was derived from a few of its most striking outward manifestations. And so intimately was it associated with the vital principle, that it might have been regarded as the cause of life. The people saw and felt that, when the living subject breathed, the mind and its affections retained their ascendancy. But when the breath departed, when the "ghost was given up," all these ceased their action, or at least were no longer manifested in the lifeless subject. The difficulty of forming an accurate idea of an invisible spirit, and the necessary relationship of breath to the living and rational man, would very naturally induce the supposition that mind, with its wonderful powers and affections, resided in the breath, and, perhaps, was identical with it. Hence, doubtless, originated the use of words denoting *breath*, in the language of the Hebrews, to signify soul, mind, or the inner spirit, which constitutes the true man. That people had not then learned all the metaphysical distinctions of a later age, between the *vegetative* soul, and the *sensitive* soul, and the *rational* soul. Consequently they might have believed, like the Egyptians, that rational souls were common both to men and beasts, and were capable of transmigration from one to the other. This doctrine, however, is nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures, and, of consequence, nowhere sanctioned by divine revelation. But the people unquestionably did conceive of the *vital* and the rational spirit, as either identical, or, at

least, so nearly analogous, as to be expressed by the same word. And, consequently, the Hebrew words, usually translated soul and spirit, are often applied both to the vital principle, and to the mind with powers and affections. Instances are very numerous, but they need not be quoted at length. It will be proper, however, to adduce a few passages in which the words appear to have a higher signification than mere animal life. In Genesis 23: 8, the word *nephesh* is used, where Abraham said to the children of Heth, "If it be *your mind* that I should bury my dead, hear me ;" that is, if you will give your *consent* ; yet the granting of this would necessarily require the exercise of a rational principle. "If thou shalt seek the Lord thy God, thou shalt find him, if thou seek him with all thy heart and all thy soul." (Deut. 4 : 29.) "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God, with all thy heart and all thy soul." (Deut. 6 : 5.) "Know thou the God of thy father, and serve him with a perfect heart and a willing *mind*," or *soul*. (1 Chron. 28 : 9.) In these instances the word *nephesh* certainly denotes something more than animal vitality. It refers to the affections, purposes, and actions of the mind ; and of consequence, the use of it recognizes the existence of a rational principle in man, which governs the actions of the body.

In like manner, when this word has the signification of *self* and *person*, it contains a necessary reference to the *mind* as constituting the *being* designated by those words. "O my soul, come not thou into their secret," (Gen. 49 : 6.) This is but a sample of

many similar passages with which the Scriptures abound, but which need not be quoted at length. The phrases, *my soul, thy soul, his soul, their souls*, and kindred expressions, refer to the inner man, to that wonderful principle which constitutes personal identity; for identity cannot be predicated of body, because body is constantly changing. Neither can it be predicated of thought, if there is no thinking principle distinct from physical organization. It is mind, the enduring, thinking substance or essence — mind, the conscious self, or soul, which constitutes the changeless *monad* — the single identical being that is felt to be the same through all the fluctuations of its existence. The Hebrews believed in some such principle in man. And as they thought it to be some way connected with life and breath, would they not very naturally make use of a word to express it, which, at the same time, might express what they would regard as correlative ideas? They unquestionably did so, in the use of the word *nephesh*.

But this is not the only word employed in a similar way. *Ruah*, usually translated *spirit*, has the primary signification of breath, but passes from that, by an easy transition, to denote both the vital principle and the rational soul. No one, probably, will question the truth of this remark. The following passages are a sample. “Thy visitation hath preserved my spirit.” (Job. 10: 12.) “And it came to pass in the morning that his spirit was troubled.” (Gen. 41: 8.) “But there is a spirit in man, and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth him understanding.” (Job. 32: 8.)

These are but a sketch of what might be quoted, but they show that the word was used to denote something different from breath, and more than animal life. In the last passage, the spirit evidently means the principle or substance which thinks, and is capable of receiving the understanding which the Almighty gives. In many passages, the word denotes the passions, emotions, dispositions, and temper of the mind. In this case it distinctly recognizes the existence of a spiritual essence, the seat and subject of these passions and emotions. Of this class are the following: "In whose spirit there is no guile," (Ps. 32: 2.) "The Lord saveth such as be of a contrite spirit." (Ps. 34: 18.) "Renew a right spirit within me." (Ps. 51: 10.) Further quotations are unnecessary. The reader is referred to a work on "*The Soul*," lately published by Professor Bush.

It may be deemed indisputable, then, that the Hebrews did employ the words above mentioned, to convey the idea of a spirit existing in man distinct from the body. No matter how incorrect were their views. It is certain that their psychology embraced a rational soul, capable of thought and feeling, and having power to exist separate from the flesh. Would it not, then, be natural for a people, with such impressions, when speaking of death, to refer to this principle as departing from its tenement? That they did conceive of it in this way, and refer to it in this way, is evident from the Sacred Records. The following passages, among others, confirm this remark: "His *breath (spirit)* goeth forth, he re-

turneth to the earth ; in that very day his thoughts (*counsels*) perish." (Ps. 146 : 4.) "Into thy hands I commit my *spirit*." (Ps. 31 : 5.) "No man hath power over the *spirit* to retain the *spirit*, neither hath he power in the day of death." (Eccl. 8 : 8.) These passages evidently refer to something which goes forth at death, and which no man can retain. It may be the vital breath ; but when it had gone, and the man lay lifeless and senseless as the ground from which he came, a rude people would naturally regard it as a departure of the rational spirit. And the use of such language, by the prophets, would be calculated to confirm such an impression.

4. The errors which had been involved in this ancient idea, and the obscurity which rested on the subject, were removed by the clear light of Christianity. No one will doubt that Christ and his apostles revealed a resurrection of the dead. There might have been a few instances of the revivification of deceased persons, before the era of the Christian dispensation, and a protraction, in this world, of the life thus restored. But there had been no disclosure of a resurrection like that revealed by the Son of God. All that was known of man's condition beyond this life was embraced in that small portion of truth, which, out of the current opinions concerning the soul and its residence in *Sheol*, had been sanctioned by the sacred writers. To the records of the Christian dispensation, therefore, application must be made for a full development of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead.

But in disclosing the fact and the nature of the resurrection, do the writers of these records necessarily disaffirm and invalidate all prior convictions concerning the future? They certainly make no direct denial of the soul's continued life after leaving its earthly tenement. On the other hand, is not this idea virtually, if not directly and positively, re-affirmed? Does not the very announcement, that "there shall be a resurrection," presuppose a continuance of the spirit's life after the dissolution of the body? At any rate, that which is to be raised, as will be seen hereafter, whatever it may be, does not entirely cease its existence. Is this the body? No; it is not, as we have seen in the previous chapter.

What, then, is to be raised from the dead? It is mind, or spirit — that enduring essence in which the proper identity of the person exists. If this be the case, then the mind or spirit is not extinguished — not lost or annihilated at death. Though it must undergo that change, in its relation to outward things, which is called death, yet it does not, thereby, cease to exist. If there should be an entire cessation of its existence — an utter extinction of the whole man or person, body, soul, spirit, identity — there could be no resurrection. God may be able, indeed, to create new beings; but not to raise up *old ones*, unless there be something belonging to the old ones yet undissolved and existing, to be raised to a higher state. If, then, the person shall be the same hereafter as here — if the soul shall retain its identity in the resurrection — it must continue to

exist through all the changes of its condition, prior to that glorious era. The very idea of a resurrection — *anastasis*, or *standing up again* — necessarily presupposes the continuance of the thing raised — of mind or spirit, undying and undecaying, beyond this life. No power can call from nonentity the lost being, and make it the same, for there can be nothing left to form the subject of a resurrection.

What, then, constitutes the resurrection? It is not the resuscitation of a dead soul; nor the reformation of a spirit from its scattered and dissolved spiritual elements; nor yet the awaking of the soul from a long, deep, dreary and dreamless sleep! But, in a metaphysical sense, it is the great change which takes place in the *condition* and *relations* of the soul. What is death? Every scriptural representation seems to indicate that it is a departure of the living spirit from its earthly temple. Through every period of the Hebrew commonwealth, this idea prevailed among the people. It is very similar to the impression which prevails at the present time. And this idea seems to be recognized as a truth, by the writers of both the Old and New Testaments, in their references to the giving up of the ghost. When the Redeemer was nailed to the cross, his biographer states that "He cried and yielded up the ghost" — *pneuma* — (Matt. 27 : 50.) So, likewise, the prayer of Stephen, (Acts 8 : 59,) "Lord Jesus, receive my *spirit*," shows clearly enough the conviction of the sainted martyr, that his spirit (*pneuma*) was about to depart from his body; and that, he doubtless felt,

was death. There was a thing, therefore, conceived of, as departing from the body; and this, in the Scriptures, is recognized as a separate being. If, then, such is death, what is the resurrection? Is it not clear that it must have some reference to this departure of the spirit? Is it not the return of the departing spirit to the inheritance of some sort of body? It is certain that there is a "natural body, and there is a spiritual body." And an inspired apostle has affirmed, with reference to the dead, "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body." (1 Cor. 15: 44.) That the word spiritual (*pneumatikos*) has, in this passage, a metaphysical, and not a moral sense, is evident from the fact that, in the latter sense, it is wholly inapplicable to *body*; for body, without the mind or spirit, has no moral feeling.* It is the mind or soul of man, and that alone,

* Professor Bush affirms that "the apostle is here expressly contrasting the *sōma phuchikon*, natural body, with *sōma pneumatikon*, spiritual body, in moral rather than metaphysical respects;" and the words, therefore, should be understood accordingly. It must be confessed, however, that such a declaration, from such a writer, is somewhat surprising, not because it is new, but because it is so apparently opposed to the facts in the case. The whole drift of the apostle's argument seems clearly to show that he was speaking concerning a change of *elements*, not of character, and presenting the contrast between the *material* or *essence* of the present and the future body, "How are the dead raised, and with what body do they come?" Not, surely, with a mere moral body, or a body morally glorious; for such qualities appertain only to the mind as the seat of moral affections. He evidently intended to ask what kind of substance or *essence* shall compose the future body. That which thou ~~so~~ *vest* dies; But God giveth it a body. So with the dead. Cast into the earth with a material body, they are to be raised differently, with a most refined and subtle body, composed of spiritual elements, and fitted for the indwelling of the perfected mind. The following context shows that this was his meaning.

which is the seat and subject of all moral affections. The body is a mere instrument through which the spirit is able to manifest itself, and hold communion with other spirits or minds—a sort of temple, in which it lives, and acts, and looks out upon the outward world.* The language of the apostle, then, shows that, as death is merely a departure of the spirit from its earthly body; so the resurrection is the return of the same spirit or mind to dwell in that spiritual body prepared for its reception. And this surely implies that there must be something existing to return again, and stand up, or be elevated to a higher condition in a glorious body; something which, on its departure, retains the identity of its being, in a disembodied state, and bears back the consciousness

(1 Cor. 15: 35—56.) The first body is earthly, composed of material elements; the second is heavenly or spiritual. The first cannot dwell in the condition of the second. "Flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption." "The mortal must put on immortality." All this seems conclusive in showing that *soma pneumatikon* is to be taken in a metaphysical and not a moral sense. So the Christian fathers believed. See Macknight, on the Epistles; Locke, on 1 Corinthians; Rosenmüller, Scholia, in loco. Beza, in Nov. Testamentum.

* The new vagary of Professor Bush that the *phuche* or *vital principle*, is a sort of shell or "involucrum" for the *pneuma*; and that after death it is to grow up into a spiritual or physical body for the glorified spirit is hardly worth a confutation. It seems perfectly harmless. It may be satisfactory to some minds in accounting for the difference between men and brutes; and though it gives souls to the latter, yet these are *seeds* without immortality—mere blasted *psyches*! But such a principle as the germ of a future body is both unnecessary and unrecognized in the Scriptures. God can, and will, give a new body constructed of spiritual elements, according to his pleasure, as at first he gave the natural body.

of that identity into the spiritual *vehiculum* prepared for it. This idea seems to stand out prominently in the general argument of Paul on the resurrection of the dead. (1 Cor. 15.)

The same idea is conveyed both by Paul and other apostles, in various portions of the Sacred Word. The following passages, among others, may be quoted: "For we know that, if our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens." (2 Cor. 5: 1.) "Yea, I think it meet, as long as I am in this tabernacle, to stir you up * * * * knowing that I must shortly put off this tabernacle." (2 Peter, 1: 13.) What is the earthly house, or "this tabernacle," but the material body? And who constitute the *I* and *we* that inherit the earthly tabernacle which may be dissolved? Does not the apostle refer to the spiritual part, the mind, or soul, that dwells in the body? It seems hardly possible to doubt that he speaks here of intellectual identity—the conscious soul, that is capable of existing separate from the body. What, then, is the "building of God," of which he speaks as our inheritance after leaving the earthly tabernacle? It is evidently that spiritual body, (*soma pneumatikon*), of which he had treated at some length, in his epistle. But the "we" are mentioned as distinct, both from the earthly and the heavenly house. In 2 Cor. 5: 4, the apostle declares that the same "*we*, that are in this tabernacle, do groan, being burdened, not for that we would be unclothed, but clothed upon" —

“clothed upon with our house which is from heaven”—“that mortality might be swallowed up of life.” Can any thing be plainer than the language here used? The metaphor is changed from a *house* to vestments; but still there is the necessary recognition of a continuing spirit, separate from the outward covering, to be unclothed and clothed upon. There is a thing existing — a conscious self — that goes out of its earthly dwelling and into its house not made with hands; that puts off its mortal vesture, and is clothed with celestial garments. This whole passage, then, whatever efforts may have been made to change its meaning, does conclusively prove the existence of a living spirit, which, after leaving the body, shall be clothed with glorious vestments, or invested with a spiritual vehicle, a celestial body.*

Thus far, then, the evidence derived from the Christian oracles avails to prove the existence of a spirit in man, which death cannot annihilate; which continues, perhaps, disembodied, until invested with a spiritual vehicle, and raised to a higher condition. And this serves to confirm the great truth respecting the soul’s continuance, which the Jewish Scriptures have, in some measure, set forth and sanctioned, in their frequent references to the spirit and its abode

* Vide Hammond, Annotations on 2 Cor. 5: 1.

Hic locus (2 Cor. 5: 1) videtur confirmare hypothesin de evolutione corporis subtilioris statim post mortem inchoanda. (Rosenmüller, Scholia, in loco.) But it does not show that the new spiritual body is eliminated from the vital elements (*anima*) of the living being, when that being passes to the grave. The antithesis indicates that we shall receive from God a new body of celestial elements, which shall never die.

in *Sheol*. It sanctions no errors concerning *Sheol*, into which the people had fallen, and which had been mentioned, without correction, by the Jewish writers; but it does show that the general impression, respecting another life, had some foundation in fact. There was a *groundwork* of truth, however fanciful might have been the superstructure built upon it. And it cannot be questioned that the early inspired writers intended to sanction every thing that was true, in the current opinions in reference to the soul and its future condition.

But nothing which has yet been said has had any particular reference to another great question that is answered by the Christian revelation. The Jewish Scriptures evidently assume the existence of a *soul* more permanent and enduring than its temple, the body. But the inquiry is equally important, Is that soul immortal? This question receives no affirmative answer in the Old Testament. Though conjecture, embracing the soul's immortality, in connection with the doctrine of metempsychosis, might have prevailed to some extent amid the speculations of philosophy; yet there is no allusion to this idea, in the Jewish Scriptures, and, of consequence, it remained unrevealed until the dawn of Christianity. But what are the utterings of the Christian system, on this subject? It is admitted, by all who embrace it, that immortality is announced as the portion of every being in the resurrection. Opinion, however, is divided on the question whether it is a primitive attribute of the soul, or a gift communicated by a

higher power after man has begun his existence. But the weight of scriptural evidence seems to indicate that it is a primitive attribute, entering essentially into the composition of the human spirit at its creation. A passage confirming this remark may be found in 2 Tim. 1 : 10, where Paul announces, to his fellow-disciples, the grace of God, "made manifest by the appearing of our Saviour Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel." This declaration was evidently made concerning something *disclosed*, not *created* nor *communicated*—something which had existed as a fact, in prior ages, but was then, for the first time, brought to light, or revealed to the world. The *life* here mentioned, as distinguished from immortality, was unquestionably that spiritual life, which was "hid with Christ in God"—or the "mystery that was hid from ages and generations;" or, again, the kingdom of God, a dispensation of righteousness called *everlasting life*, and designed to effect the regeneration and ultimate obedience of all mankind. But the immortality brought to light was evidently something different from life. Was it not an attribute of the soul, which, though a subject of conjecture, had never before received the divine sanction as a fundamental article of religious truth? Immortality of some beings was brought to light; but not surely the immortality of angels, or of beings in another sphere of action. It was the immortality of mankind. But this could not have been disclosed, unless it had been possessed

as an inherent attribute of the soul, prior to its disclosure — before the appearing of Christ.

Is it any marvel that the soul should be immortal, and its possessor know it not? How long is it since a close and persevering chemical analysis has disclosed the primary elements of the human body? But is it any more true now, that the outward temple of the soul is composed of oxygen, carbon, hydrogen, iron, lime, phosphorus, and other elements, in chemical combination, than it was during that long, dim period of fruitless speculation, in which the world had not even dreamed of the wonderful and useful developments which modern chemistry has made? Revelation has disclosed a great fact relative to the *inner* man, showing its continuance beyond the transient scenes of this world. But it was left for man himself to discover, as best he could, the elements of his outward being, which must soon dissolve and enter into new organizations. Nor does the assertion that "God only hath immortality," (1 Tim. 6: 16,) furnish any ground for denying the original immortality of the human soul. It is not true in point of fact, that, at the time when that language was used by the apostle, no being but God had immortality. Unquestionably there were spiritual beings, called *angels*, who, long before the apostle's day, possessed the same attribute. And surely it was long before this time, that Christ had arisen and ascended to a state where he could experience "no more death," and where, in respect to his outward vehicle, he had been formed "after the power

of an endless life," (Heb. 7: 16.) The meaning of the passage, then, is — not that no other being but God is immortal — but that no other being hath underived immortality — none but God hath the attribute in and of himself. Every other being derives immortality, like its existence, from the great Fountain of all things. And the Scriptures surely present strong indications that this Being, in creating human souls, has endowed them with the same attribute.

The souls, then, or spirits of men, are created immortal, but they are required to dwell for a time in transient and dissolving bodies. The apostle, howevēr, seems to show that they are ultimately to be invested with bodies of an essence similar to their own, to which will be communicated the attribute of immortality. "This corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality." (1 Cor. 15: 53.) The same idea is unquestionably conveyed by another passage, (2 Cor. 5: 1—4,) where the soul is represented as putting off its earthly house and putting on its house from heaven. In the latter passage, therefore, the apostle fully explains what he means by the former. He speaks of "the corruptible" and "the mortal" in the use of metonymy, referring, doubtless, to the spirit that dwells in a corruptible, mortal, and dissolving vehicle; but this spirit, he affirms, must be invested with something immortal. It must be disrobed of its decaying garments, and clothed upon with its immortal vesture — leaving its earthly temple, it must enter into

its "house not made with hands." In other words, the immortal and incorruptible must supervene upon the transient and perishable. And is not that change of body like the changing of garments — a putting off of the old and fading, and a putting on of the new and glorious? Such surely appears to be the meaning of the apostle; and it shows that a spiritual and immortal vehicle shall succeed the material and decaying body which the soul at present inherits. It was not the spirit that was to receive this new attribute; for the spirit is already immortal. But it was to be invested with a body similar to itself in nature and properties; and this of course must be immortal.

When that event shall have transpired, man will have entered upon an existence peculiar and glorious, which is sometimes called a "state of immortality." Still the attribute itself belongs solely to the being in his inward and outward nature, (and not to the peculiar *state* in which he is placed. No matter what may be his condition; if the soul and its spiritual vehicle are immortal, man, the being, is in a state of immortality.) The attribute, however, has no inseparable connection with the *moral* condition. Man is not necessarily perfect, because his soul and its spiritual vesture are immortal. It is true that in the resurrection, "they neither marry nor are given in marriage, neither can they die any more, but are equal unto the angels, and are the children of God, being the children of the resurrection." (Luke 20 : 35, 36.) But it is not the mere

outward change, (the act of resurrection,) the passage out of the mortal body, and entrance into the spiritual house, which makes them children of God. A *moral* change is necessary to bring the soul into that peculiar relationship. This, however, is digression, which cannot be pursued farther. Immortality is predicated of spirits raised from the dead, in the assertion that they "cannot die any more." And further, when the soul enters into its spiritual body, it takes the similitude of celestial beings; not necessarily *equal* to them, but *like angels*, (*is angelloi*),* and therefore immortal. Are not angels immortal, both in their intellectual essence, and the attenuated spiritual *vehiculum*, in which it dwells? No one will dispute the fact. It is doubtless the possession of this attribute which, in one respect, renders the human spirit, in its immortal vehicle, "as the angels of God in heaven."

It is not necessary to proceed farther with the examination of scriptural evidences which tend to the development of this subject. The conclusion of the whole matter is, that the Scriptures do teach the existence of a principle in man, called soul, mind, or spirit, which is immortal.

* The word evidently denotes resemblance, *not equality*. So, in Matthew 22: 30, "They are *os angelloias*, the angels," &c. There is no reference to equality. Similitude is far from implying it.

CHAPTER VII.

N EXAMINATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

HAVING seen that the resurrection of the material body is not founded in reason — that there is nothing in the nature of things which demands a simultaneous resurrection; and having come to the conclusion that such a resurrection will not take place, may inquire, What do the Scriptures say of these matters? Do they contradict the positions we have seen? If we credit the work of certain expositors we do. There are certain passages which are supposed to teach that there will be a simultaneous resurrection, and that when this takes place, all the bones of all the human beings that have ever lived on the earth shall be raised, and shall clothe the disembodied spirits which had once inhabited them. Our business shall now be to give some of these passages a close examination. We will commence with the Old Testament. Many passages, however, which are pressed into the service of the doctrines under consideration, do not need this labor; for, if common sense is allowed any considerable scope, it will be plain that they give it no support and that their real meaning is very obvious. Of this character are

those recorded in Genesis 18 : 7, 8. Psalms 16 : 9, 10. Psalms 17 : 15, and 49 : 14, 15. Isaiah 25 : 7, 8. Ezekiel 37 : 1—14. Hosea 6 : 2, and 13 : 14.

The following passages have perplexed many, and confirmed not a few in the belief of a general and bodily resurrection. And those who are strongly wedded to this faith may feel that the language employed expresses, as well as it can, their preconceived opinions.

JOB 19 : 25, 26, 27 :—For I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth : and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God ; whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another ; though my reins be consumed within me.

We shall find by examination, that the learned have translated this passage in a variety of ways, and that it is very pliable in the hands of expositors. This fact should admonish us not to be too positive in relation to its import, but to be cautious and not set it up as a pillar to any system.

Many understand that it teaches three things, viz : that the word Redeemer refers to the promised Messiah ; that he shall stand at the last day, when the earth shall be destroyed and the resurrection take place, and judge all men ; and that Job himself will, at or shortly subsequent to that period, see God in his flesh, having been clothed upon by the same fleshly body, which had been once laid in the grave and consumed by the worms, but which is now re-

covered from the dust and re-organized and made a fit tenement for an immaculate spirit.

But what is there in this passage, or in the whole book of Job, that gives the least countenance to this view? There is the word Redeemer, to be sure; but the original import of the term is very far from supporting the idea that Job had reference to the Saviour when he used it. Interpreters have variously rendered it; they say it may be defined thus:—*vindicator, avenger, deliverer*; and in the sense of *vindicator* Job without doubt employed it in the text. For we learn from the context that he was reduced, by a succession of calamitous circumstances, to a most wretched state of poverty, disease, alienated friendship, domestic trouble, and bereavement. He says, (chap. 7 : 5,) “ My flesh is clothed with worms and clods of dust; my skin is broken, and become loathsome.” This, and other evils, which Job was suffering, induced his pretended friends to accuse him of wickedness. They argued that God would not so afflict a just man, that sinners only were subject to such chastisement. He attempted to defend himself against the insinuations of his friends. “ Then answered Bildad, the Shuhite, and said, (8 : 1 — 6,) How long wilt thou speak these things? and how long shall the words of thy mouth be like a strong wind? Doth God pervert judgment? or doth the Almighty pervert justice? If thy children have sinned against him, and He have cast them away for their transgression; if thou wouldest seek unto God betimes, and make thy supplication to the

Almighty ; if thou wert pure and upright ; surely now He would awake for thee, and make the habitations of thy righteousness prosperous." To this Job makes a cogent and eloquent reply ; still the friends are not satisfied. Zophar, the Naamathite, continued to affirm that he had brought his distress upon himself by his unrighteousness. He said, (Job. 11 : 1—6,) " Should not a multitude of words be answered ? and a man full of talk be justified ? Should thy lies make men hold their peace ? and when thou mockest, shall no man make thee ashamed ? For thou hast said, My doctrine is pure, and I am clean in thine eyes. But O that God would speak, and open his lips against thee ; and that he would shew thee the secrets of wisdom, that they are double to that which is ! Know, therefore, that God exacteth of thee less than thine iniquity deserveth."

So they continue in this controversy, the one defending and the others accusing, till Job seems to conclude that his friends are determined to persist in urging their charges against him, whatever he might say in defence. Consequently, he asks, (Job 19 : 1 — 6,) " How long will ye vex my soul, and break me in pieces with words ? These ten times have ye reproached me : ye are not ashamed that ye make yourselves strange to me. And be it indeed that I have erred, mine error remaineth with myself. If indeed ye will magnify yourselves against me, and plead against me my reproach ; know now that God hath overthrown me, and hath compassed me

with his net." Here Job partially admits the allegation of his friends, for the purpose, no doubt, of ridding himself of their vexatious conversation; but after stating some of the evils which he suffered, and appealing to their sympathy, he manifests a confidence in God, that he would plead his cause, and that the time would come when his character and condition would be seen in a more favorable light; "For," says he, "I know that my Vindicator liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth; and though after my skin worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God; whom I shall see for myself and not another; though my reins be consumed within me." Here it is plain that Job expected to see God with his natural eyes, appearing to vindicate his character; and in this, it seems, he was not disappointed. In the conclusion, we learn that God did appear and vindicate him most faithfully. For Job addresses him thus: (42: 5,) "I have heard of thee by the hearing of the ear: but now mine eye seeth thee. Wherefore I abhor myself, and repent in dust and ashes." Then "the Lord said to Eliphaz the Temanite, my wrath is kindled against thee, and against thy two friends: for ye have not spoken of me the thing that is right, as my servant Job hath. Therefore take unto you now seven bullocks and seven rams, and go to my servant Job, and offer up for yourselves a burnt-offering: and my servant Job shall pray for you: for him will I accept: lest I deal with you after your folly, in that ye have not spoken of me the thing

which is right, like my servant Job." (42: 7, 8.) The full intent of the passage may now be plainly expressed. Job had, by the providence of God, been reduced to extreme wretchedness. His friends referred his adversity to a wrong cause; they asserted that he must have been a great sinner, or God would not have so afflicted him. But Job asserted that he was innocent, till he found it of no avail, till he saw that his friends were determined to persist in their accusations, in spite of all his arguments; then he admitted that the hand of God was upon him, that appearances were against him; but he still manifests confidence that all would ultimately be placed in a right point of view, by virtually saying, that though his body was full of disease, and though his adversaries had mangled him sorely, yet he should live to see God with his natural eyes, who would finally appear as his *vindicator* and friend.

This view of the text is confirmed by Dr. Ken- nicott's translation. He makes it read thus: "For I know that my Vindicator liveth; and He at last shall arise over his dust. And after that mine adversaries have mangled me thus, even in my flesh shall I see God. Whom I shall see on my side, and mine eyes shall behold him, but not estranged from me."

ISAIAH 26: 19. — Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.

This portion of Scripture is supposed to afford a

strong proof of the resurrection of the material body. If such proof exist at all in the passage, it must, of course, be found in the following words: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise."

Popular prejudice renders it necessary to give this passage a passing notice; and we hope to make it plain that the prophet, when he uttered it, did not allude to immortality at all. He occupies nearly the whole chapter in celebrating the deliverance of the Jews from their captivity in Babylon and the destruction of their adversaries, as may be seen by looking at his previous remarks. In the thirteenth verse he says, "O Lord our God, other lords beside thee have had dominion over us." This language beyond a doubt has reference to the captivity of the Jews, and this captivity was considered by the inspired writers as a state of death. Ezekiel, speaking of deliverance from it, represents the enslaved people as coming up from the place of the dead — as being delivered from their graves. His words are, (Ezekiel 37: 12,) "Thus saith the Lord; Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel." In foretelling what would come upon the people of Israel, the prophet again says, "Therefore, O thou son of man, speak unto the house of Israel; thus ye speak, saying, if our transgressions and our sins be upon us, and we pine away in them, how should we then live? Say unto them, as I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleas-

ure in the death of the wicked ; but that the wicked turn from his way and live ; turn ye, turn ye from your evil ways ; for why will ye die, O house of Israel ? (Ezekiel 33 : 10, 11.) Isaiah represents this captivity nearly in the same light. He says, (Isaiah 5 : 13, 14,) " Therefore my people are gone into captivity because they have no knowledge ; and their honorable men are famished, and their multitude dried up with thirst. Therefore hell (the grave) hath enlarged herself, and opened her mouth without measure : and their glory, and their multitude, and their pomp, and he that rejoiceth, shall descend into it." Thus it is plain that the prophets represented the Jewish nation as being dead when it was in the Babylonish captivity ; and the deliverance of this people was spoken of as a deliverance from death or the grave, as may be seen by the following : (Ezekiel 37 : 13, 14.) " And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land : then shall ye know that I the Lord have spoken it, and performed it, saith the Lord."

Now the chapter, in which the passage under consideration is found, is a song of triumph, wherein is celebrated the deliverance of Israel from bondage, in which the whole Jewish nation is made to speak as one choir ; and as the Jews were the peculiar people of God, they all speak to him as one man and say, "*Thy dead shall live,*" and then they turn to

themselves and say, "*Our dead shall rise.*" The words, *men, together, with,* found in the passage, are supplied, not being in the original. Therefore, the true sentiment of the prophet, according to Lowthe, may be expressed thus :

Thy dead shall live, my deceased, they shall arise ;
Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust !
For thy dew is as the dew of the dawn ;
But the earth shall cast forth, as an abortion, the deceased tyrants.

The following comment on this passage, by Mr. Barnes, fully sustains and elucidates the foregoing. "In Isaiah 5 : 14, the chorus (rather the nation, for this idea of a chorus is wholly conjectural) is represented as saying of the dead men and tyrants of Babylon that had oppressed the captive Jews, that they should not rise, and should no more oppress the people of God. In contradistinction from this fate of their enemies, the choir (nation) is introduced as addressing Jehovah, and saying, "They dead shall live ;" that is, thy people shall live again ; shall be restored to vigor, and strength, and enjoyment. They are now dead ; that is, they are, as I understand it, *civilly* dead in Babylon ; they are cut off from their privileges, torn away from their homes, made captive in a foreign land. Their king has been dethroned ; their temple demolished ; their princes, priests, and people, made captive ; their name blotted out from the list of nations ; and to all intents and purposes as a people they are *deceased*. The figure is one that is common, by which the loss of privileges and enjoyments, and especially of civil rights, is represented as

death. So we now speak of a man's being dead in law ; dead to enjoyment ; dead to his country ; spiritually dead ; dead in sins. I do not understand this, therefore, as referring primarily to the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, but to the captives in Babylon, who were civilly dead, and cut off by their oppressors from their rights and enjoyments as a nation. *Shall live.* Shall be restored to their country, and be re-instated in all their rights and immunities as a people among the nations of the earth. The restoration shall be as striking as would be the resurrection of the dead from their graves. *Together with my dead body shall they arise.* The words, "together, with," are not in the original. The word rendered "my dead body" literally means "my dead body," and may be applied to a man or to a beast. Lev. 5: 2; 7: 24. It is also applied to the dead in general, to the deceased, to carcasses or dead bodies. See Ps. 79: 2; Jer. 7: 33; 9: 22; 16: 18; 26: 23; Lev. 11: 11; Jer. 34: 20. It may therefore be rendered *my deceased, my dead*; and will thus be parallel with the phrase "thy dead men," and is used in the same sense with reference to the same species of resurrection. It is not the language of Isaiah as if he referred to *his* own body when it should be dead, but it is the language of the *choir* that sings, and that speaks in the name of the Jewish people. *That* people is thus introduced as saying *my* dead, that is, *our* dead shall rise. Not only in the address to Jehovah is this sentiment uttered, when it is said, "thy dead shall rise," but when attention is turned to themselves as

a people they say, "*our* dead shall rise;" those that appertain to our nation shall rise from the dead, and be restored to their own privileges and land."

DANIEL 12 : 2.— And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake ; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.

Though this text may not be quoted to prove the resurrection of the body, yet it is often referred to, by a certain class, as proof of a simultaneous resurrection and a judgment in the immortal world. But how men, who notice the whole scope and tenor of the prophet's vision, can so understand it, is not easily determined. Nothing seems plainer than that he made no allusion whatever to the immortal world. Whatever he did mean by the statement, that "many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake ; some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt, it is quite plain that this awaking was to take place when there should be a time of trouble, such as had never been before ; and this time of trouble was to be taken when Michael the great prince should stand up ; and he was to stand up when a personage spoken of in the eleventh chapter should come to his end.

Says Daniel, in the last verse of the eleventh chapter and the first verse of the twelfth : "yet he shall come to an end, and none shall help him. And at that time,"—that is, when the individual just spoken of shall come to his end,— "shall Michael stand up, and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time : and

at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt." To ascertain, then, when this passage was fulfilled, we have only to learn when the person mentioned in the forty-fifth verse of the eleventh chapter came to his end ; and this we may learn by commencing with the eleventh chapter, and tracing the events and becoming acquainted with the characters spoken of in the vision, which begins with this chapter.

It is said in the tenth chapter, that this vision was designed to make Daniel understand what should befall his people in the latter days of their national existence. The eleventh chapter commences by speaking of four kings who should reign in Persia. One of whom should be notoriously rich, and gather an army from among all nations, and march with it against Greece. This agrees with the history of Xerxes. But after this king had run his race, Daniel says, "A mighty king shall arise, and rule with great dominion and do according to his will. But when he shall have arisen, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided towards the four winds of heaven ; and not to his posterity, nor with the dominion with which he had ruled ; for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others besides those." (11 : 3, 4.) Alexander the great must have been the man here referred to ; for he had no posterity, and no king of royal blood succeeded him from Macedon, and no

kingdoms sprung out of his empire, to stand long, save the Syrian and Egyptian; the one on the North and the other on the South of Judea; which are distinguished in the Scriptures as the kingdoms of the North and the South: and as they were intimately associated with the fortunes of the Jewish nation, it was very natural that the prophets should speak of them, when expounding to that people their duty, and placing before their mental view the events of futurity. By examining this (the eleventh) chapter, from the fifth to the twentieth verse, we shall learn that Daniel predicts the history, the mutual relations, and the wars of the kings of the North and the South; and his statements agree so well with the histories of the Egyptian and Syrian Kingdoms, that their identity cannot be disputed. The twentieth verse speaks of a Northern king, "who would send a tax-collector over the glory of the kingdom, and who would in a few days be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle." This statement agrees with the history of Seleucus IV., brother and predecessor of Antiochus Epiphanes. This Seleucus sent a tax-collector over the wealthiest parts of his kingdom, and wrenched from his subjects an immense sum to pay a debt which his father had contracted with the Roman power: and he was soon after poisoned by his treasurer, who designed to wear his crown; and thus he was destroyed neither in anger nor in battle.

Daniel proceeds to say, that "In his estate," that is, in the place of this Seleucus, "shall arise a vile person, to whom they will not *give* the honor of the

Kingdom, but he shall come in peaceably and obtain the Kingdom by *flatteries*." The history of Antiochus Epiphanes is in perfect harmony with this description. He was a person of unbounded vileness. He seemed ready at all times, to stoop to the lowest embrace of debauchery and sensualism. In whatever part of his Capital he heard of obscene and drunken frolics, he was sure to visit the scene whether invited or not, and outdo all present in low buffoonry and base indecencies. He would frequently stagger from drunkenness, through the streets of the city, throwing handfuls of money among the people, crying, "Catch as catch can." Sometimes he would sally out of his place, dressed in a Roman robe, with a crown of flowers on his head and a great quantity of pebbles under his garments, which he would throw at those who attempted to follow him. His conduct at the public baths was so vile that it ought not to be mentioned here. The *honor* of the Kingdom was not *given* him. There were a number of competitors for the crown and each had friends. There were his brother's son, his brother's murderer, and his brother's nephew, Ptolomy king of Egypt, all of whom had parties more or less strong, favoring their pretensions to the Crown: but by flattery, low intrigue, and promises, Antiochus was enabled to crush the influence of his rivals, and seize the reins of government without being much opposed by the people. Daniel goes on to say, that "with the arms of a flood," as by widely extended and swiftly rushing waters, "shall they," i. e., his rivals, "be overflowed from before

him, and be broken, yea, also the prince of the covenant," i. e., the Jewish high priest ; for whenever the covenant is mentioned, unconnected with specific parties between whom it had been made, it invariably refers to the covenant which God made with the Jews, and of which the high priest was *prince* or principal minister. It is very natural that the high priest should be spoken of in close connexion with the defeat of Antiochus. For scarcely had he assumed the responsibilities of his reign, when he dispossessed the high priest then in office of his authority, and elevated to his place a miserable tool of his own, who was sworn to disseminate heathen notions and practices among his countrymen. Immediately, subsequent to a certain contract or league, Daniel says, " he shall work deceitfully ;" and twice does Josephus mention a league between Antiochus and the Jewish rulers, made previous to the outrages which he perpetrated against the city of Jerusalem. Once he says, " he, pretending peace, got the city by treachery, and ventured to break the league he had made, and again he attacked us while we were his associates and friends." But the prophet goes on : " He shall come up," or shall rise, " and grow strong with a small people." During the reigns of the two kings which preceded Antiochus, Syria had been greatly weakened and reduced in resources ; but under him it increased with wonderful speed. " He shall," says Daniel, " enter peaceably upon the fattest provinces of the land ; and shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers ; he shall scatter among them the

prey and spoil and riches." He had never been surpassed in the amplitude of his liberality to his soldiers and friends. "And he shall form his devices against the strong holds for a long time," shall lay his plans cautiously, "and shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the South," (of Egypt,) "with a great army; and the king of the South shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army, but he shall not stand, for they shall form devices against him, yea, they that eat of his food shall destroy him, and the army of his enemy shall overflow his forces, and many shall fall down slain." This was accomplished precisely according to the prediction. Antiochus conquered Ptolomy, of Egypt, not so much by superior strength as by the treachery of Ptolomy's ministers, who basely betrayed their trust, and thus assisted his enemy in subduing him. Ptolomy gave himself into the hands of Antiochus, as a prisoner of war, who at first treated him with great condescension and apparent kindness; they eat together at the same table, where they labored with all their ability to overreach and deceive each other; which conduct Daniel describes, by saying, "And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper; for yet the end shall be at the time appointed." "Then," says the prophet, "shall he," Antiochus, "return into his own land with great riches; and he will set his heart against the holy covenant, (i. e., of the Jews,) and he will execute his purpose, and return to his own land." About this time Antiochus

marched into Jerusalem with an army, slew 40,000, and forced many of the inhabitants into servitude, and with his own hands robbed the temple. "At the time appointed," continues the prophet, "he shall go again against the South; but it shall not be the second time as the first, for ships of Chittim, (a name signifying islands in the Mediterranean,) shall come against him, and he shall be discouraged and return, and be enraged against the holy covenant and execute his purpose." Antiochus projected a new scheme for the subjugation of Egypt; but it came to naught; for the new king of Egypt had applied to the Romans for assistance, and the senate despatched ambassadors, who took passage on board a Greek fleet which was at Delos, (one of the islands designated by the term Chittim,) met Antiochus as he was about to besiege Alexandria, and forced him to abandon his project and flee from Egypt, by menacing him with the vengeance of Roman displeasure. Chagrined and infuriated by this defeat, while on his way home, he sent one of his generals with a detachment of 22,000, to sack the city of Jerusalem, and open a scene of persecution and brutal warfare, which continued without cessation for more than three and a half years. Daniel proceeds, "He shall even return and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant," that is, with the apostate Jews, from whom he constantly expected to receive material assistance. "And forces shall be raised by him, which shall pollute the sanctuary, of strength, and take away the daily sacrifice, and shall set up the abomination that maketh desolate;"

i. e., images and idols, and heathen worship, which was an abomination to all faithful Jews, and which really took place. "And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries; but the people that do know their God shall be strong and do exploits;" nor does the whole of history speak of more wonderful exploits than those performed by the Maccabee family and others during that period. "And they that have understanding among the people shall instruct many;" which they did in the most faithful manner; "And they shall fall by the sword and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days. And whilst they fall they shall be holpen with a little help." Judas Maccabeus, from the beginning, gained some partial advantages; but many shall "cleave to them with flatteries;" flattery was an instrument upon which Antiochus depended for success, and which he constantly employed; "and some of them of understanding shall fall," shall fall martyrs, to try them, and to purge and to make them white, even to the time of the end, because it is yet for a time appointed." "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every God, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods; and shall prosper until the indignation be accomplished; for that which is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women," i. e., the idol gods, Astarte and Anaitis, to the worship of which the women of Syria were particularly devoted; "nor regard any god, for he shall magnify himself above

all." Antiochus was a reviler of all religions, robbed and desecrated all temples, exalted himself above all the gods, and with a fiendish joy he labored to subvert all established modes of worship, and to erect new systems in the places thereof. "But in their places shall he honor the god of forces," or of strong holds, "and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and with silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things." He sought to establish in Syria the worship of Hercules; he gave particular reverence to this god whom his fathers knew not, and who was very properly called the god of strong holds and strength. The true sense of the next verse is, "He shall act against the fortified palaces with a strong god, and shall introduce unto them the worship of this strange god Hercules, and whoever acknowledges him, to him he will give great honor, and give him dominion over many, and divide the land among them for reward," all of which agrees with the common liberality of Antiochus towards those who favored his schemes; for he was munificent in his gifts to those sufficiently servile to please his fancy.

The prophet now recapitulates Antiochus' successes, which have just been enumerated, in order to exhibit his sudden fall and disgraceful end, in the clearest possible light. "At the time of the end, or the accomplishment that is, when this vision shall be accomplished, the king of the South (of Egypt) shall push at him, and against him shall the king of the North (of Syria) come like a whirlwind, with chariots and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he

shall enter into the countries, those regions, and overflow them, and pass over them. He shall also enter the land, Palestine, "the glory of the whole earth," (as the Jews considered and styled it,) and multitudes shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand, Edom and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon," (which nations there is no evidence from history that Antiochus ever injured or disturbed.) He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries, and the land of Egypt shall not escape. And he shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt, shall get control over all the wealth of Egypt, and the Syrians and Ethiopians shall be at his steps or in his train," that is, shall serve him; for great numbers from these nations had been made slaves in Egypt, and the victories of Antiochus placed them entirely in his hands. Yet, after all this success, "tidings out of the East and out of the North shall trouble him; therefore shall he go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many." Near the close of his career, he received intelligence that his eastern provinces of Persia and Media, and his northern province of Armenia, were in a state of rebellion, and about to repudiate his authority. Consequently he took measures to subdue his rebellious subjects and chastise them for their audacity in rejecting his authority. And here the prophet presents us with another striking contrast between his prosperity and adversity. "He shall plant the tabernacle of his palace between the seas, in the glorious holy mountain," that is, on

Mount Zion, between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean, seeming disposed to control both; and there he did encamp and raise strong fortifications. "Yet he shall come to his end and none shall help him." While on his march to his revolted provinces, he went out of his way to visit the city of Elymais, for the purpose of plundering a very rich temple of Diana. But he met with a rough reception, and was forced to retreat to Ecbatana. There he heard that his army in Judea had been defeated, and that the temple had been re-dedicated to God. He suddenly commenced his return, and overflowing with rage and fury, he swore that he would sink the whole Jewish nation-beneath the ruins of Jerusalem. On he went night and day, ordering his charioteer not to stop for rest or sleep. A most malignant and painful disease laid its hand upon him, yet onward he drove, till accidentally precipitated from his chariot upon the ground. A litter was then provided, upon which he was laid and hurried on, all bruised and exhausted as he was; but he was finally forced to halt at an obscure village on the borders of Persia, where he expired in the most excruciating misery, both of body and mind. "So he came to his end and none helped him."

Here commences the twelfth chapter. At that time, when Antiochus shall come to his end, shall Michael arise, the great prince that standeth up for the children of thy people, the guardian angel of the Jews; and there shall be, that is, in those days just described, a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that time; but at that time shall

thy people be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book, that is, God's book of favor and deliverance. And many of those that sleep in the dust of the earth, who fall asleep, die, perish, are slain, during those times of trouble, shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt; that is, those who fall in their country's cause and are dishonored by Antiochus, shall rise to live in the memory of man in immortal honor and respect;—while those who are seduced by him to forsake their country, their religion and their God, shall rise to live in the memory of man in that immortal infamy and contempt which awaits the traitor. “And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness,” that confirm the faith and courage of their brethren, as the stars forever and ever in the moral heavens.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE SECOND ADVENT OF CHRIST.

THE subject to be considered in this chapter is the second advent of Christ. And though one of the most important subjects in the commonwealth of theology, perhaps it may be thought by many to be hackneyed, and withal rather void of interest, since it has been so much mooted, and especially within a few years past. I am not aware that any thing particularly new can be said upon it, or that any thing more is needed to expose the folly of those who have greatly disturbed the public mind by endeavoring to propagate their absurd fancies and wild speculations concerning the second coming of Christ. But the event occupies so high and broad a place in the New Testament, and is so connected with nearly all the teachings of Christ and the apostles, that it is almost impossible to investigate, at any considerable extent, any other subject belonging to the Christian system without having more or less to do with this. It has so long been associated in the public mind with the resurrection of the dead, that it is almost impossible to present a clear view of the latter without a pretty thorough examination of the former. It has so many bearings also that much space is required to give it any thing like a fair consideration.

Nothing is more plainly taught in the New Testament than the second coming of Christ. Our Saviour spoke of it as positively and distinctly as he did of any event which he foretold, or of any sentiment which he inculcated. The apostles were so much impressed with its truth and importance, that they gave it a prominent place in all their instructions. No professed follower of Christ pretended to doubt it. Indeed they could not, if they regarded his most express and definite language. John 14 : 18—"I will not leave you comfortless ; I will come to you ;" verse 28 : "ye have heard how I said unto you, I go away, and *come again* unto you." And this coming has by no means reference to his resurrection ; for in John 21 : 22, 23, we have this language, which was spoken after that event : "Jesus saith unto him, if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ? follow thou me. Then went this saying abroad among the brethren that that disciple should not die ; yet Jesus said not unto him, he shall not die ; but if I will that he tarry till I come, what is that to thee ?"

The time of this coming is stated with equal positiveness and perspicuity. It was to take place during the lifetime of some of Christ's contemporaries. He was very careful to state this fact in the most explicit terms. He says, Matt. 16 : 27, 28, "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels ; and then shall he reward every man according to his works. Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom. "The

parallels are Mark 8 : 38. 9 : 1. Luke 9 : 26, 27, and Matt. 24 : 30, 31.

The disciples put all confidence in these declarations ; hence they taught and believed that their Master would speedily make his second appearance. That the apostles thought the second advent to be near at hand when they wrote is obvious from their manner of expression. "The Lord is at hand." "Behold the judge standeth at the door." "He that shall come, will come and will not tarry." "The night is far spent, the day is at hand." "Behold I come quickly, and my reward is with me." "The time is short." "The time is at hand." "Be ye also patient ; establish your hearts for the coming of the Lord *draweth nigh.*"

One thing should be particularly noticed here, namely, Christ in a number of instances specified the time and object of his second advent ; and, I believe, in every one of those instances, he stated the object was to establish his kingdom and to exercise his kingly authority in the moral world ; and he limited the time of his coming to the space of a few years, or rather, he declared, as we have seen, that it would be within the lifetime of some of his disciples, or of the generation then living. There are other places in the New Testament, where mention is made of the coming of the Son of man, without a specification of time. Now, by what authority or rule of interpretation, can comings, thus mentioned, be made to refer to the end of time, the conflagration of the world, or to the death of individuals ? There is

nothing in reason that will admit of such procedure. Should a person, in whose employ I was, say to me that he was about to go a journey, but that he should return in a few weeks, say six ; and in giving me instructions personally or through his other servants, in relation to certain business transactions committed to my care, should he often speak of his return without again mentioning the time of it, would it be reasonable or natural for me to understand that he would not return under forty years ? By no means. I must, in all reason, understand such mention of a return to be the same as that first mentioned in connexion with limitations and specifications with regard to time. By the same rule are we to interpret the passages which relate to the coming of Christ. Wherever we find that spoken of, without any specification of time, we are to regard it as referring to the coming of Christ in his kingdom, which he declared should take place before the generation then living should pass away, because mention is made of no other coming.

But in what manner did Christ come the second time ? Did he appear bodily during the lifetime of that generation or during the apostolic age ? To my knowledge, none pretend to believe this, nor that he has yet appeared personally upon the earth. That he has come the second time, none who regard his language can doubt ; for it is unequivocal and can admit of but one rational interpretation. If he has not come the second time, then has he used language involving him in a most palpable falsehood, and there is no probability that he ever will come ; for, if he

has made a false statement in relation to the *time*, we have good reason to believe that he has in relation to the entire event. That his second advent has taken place there is ample proof; but that he has appeared bodily and personally since his ascension, we have not the slightest evidence. He never intimated to his disciples, nor to any one else, that he should make such an appearance. He always represented that he should come in spirit, in the glory of his Father, in his kingdom. The very nature of his kingdom precludes the idea of his coming in person. He never pretended that it was of a temporal character. He declared that it was not of this world, and told his disciples that they must not expect *earthly* greatness, that they would be hated as he was hated, that they would be persecuted even unto death, and that, if they continued faithful to him, they would finally die as he himself should die. "And when he was demanded of the Pharisees, when the kingdom of God (the kingdom of God and the kingdom of heaven are interchangeable phrases) should come, he answered them and said, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation. Neither shall they say, Lo here! or lo there! for behold the kingdom of God is within you." (Luke 17: 20, 21.) "The kingdom of God is not meat nor drink; but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." (Romans 14: 7.) Here it is plain that the kingdom, in which Christ was to come, was to be established in the hearts of men, wherein he would reign through the power of grace and truth. And as the kingdom was of a spiritual

and providential character, so, of course, would be his second coming. It would be like the operation of leaven upon meal. It would be the secret, invisible influence of truth and love on the hearts of men, penetrating and changing them, till moulded to their influence and assimilated to their nature. "The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened." (Matt 13 : 33.)

Were the kingdom of Christ a temporal domain, then we might suppose that he would have come personally and taken his seat upon a literal throne, to sway the sceptre of outward power. But we have seen that he was to come in his kingdom, and that this kingdom was to be set up in the souls of men, and his authority was to be exercised there ; consequently his coming must be in a manner suited to it, in power, in truth, and in love.

This being the nature of his coming, it must of necessity be a progressive work. He was to come and reign in his kingdom, till he should "subdue all things to himself"—till "the kingdoms of this world become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ." (1 Cor. 15 : 24—28. Rev. 11 : 15.) But this was not to be accomplished in a moment. A long period of time was required to make such a conquest. Christ himself compared the advancement and development of his kingdom to a grain of mustard seed ; which, when put in the ground, germinates, springs forth, and gradually strengthens and spreads abroad its branches, till it finally becomes a shelter and resting place

for the fowls of heaven. (Matt. 13: 31, 32.) In opposition to this view, other language of Christ may be referred to, where he says, in speaking of his second advent, "This generation shall not pass away till all these things be fulfilled." But, in reply, it is only necessary to say, that according to good authority, this passage ought to be rendered, "This generation shall not pass away till all these things shall be," that is, shall be fulfilling, or *shall begin to be*. Thus a full termination is not expressed in the original, but simply a commencement and a running on into futurity—a continued course of action from the beginning.

It is necessary to consider the second advent of Christ as a progressive event. The Christian Scriptures require this, in order that their prophecies may be explained so as to agree with facts found in history. His reign commenced very soon after his death, and has continued to advance till now, and will go on till the kingdoms of this world submit to his authority. Its advancement has been marked by a number of important epochs; it has made several strong and prominent points in the pathway of its progress, which were of great advantage to the kingdom, and contributed much to its extension and power. In fact it might have been said on several occasions that it came with power. The destruction of Jerusalem, and of Paganism in the Roman Empire; the conversion of the barbarous nations of Europe to Christianity, and the Protestant Reformation, were epochs of no small importance. Speaking

poetically, or according to oriental metaphor, Christ then "came in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory." And history bears the fact plainly upon its face, that these distinguished epochs were events exceedingly productive of national commotions, wars, and calamities. Just before the metropolis of Judea sunk in ruins, there were wild and fearful insurrections, sanguinary battles, famines, pestilences and great distress. And the conversion of the Roman Empire to Christianity, under Constantine, was accomplished in the midst of stupendous and brutal wars; the great central power which reared and sustained the Empire was now nearly paralysed and set at defiance, 'The glory and authority of the city of Rome and her legislators had now dwindled to a mere shadow. The army was now the only repository of power. The soldier of the most skill and prowess stood in the highest place of authority. The purple was a prize for which rival emperors strove. There was now revolutions in the provinces, mutiny in the army; confusion and rapine reigned triumphant throughout the known world. The Roman Empire, though a Colossus in strength, fell by pieces or in fragments to the ground. It was, says one, as if a thousand mastiffs had attacked one great lion. They reduced him by inches. Long and fierce was the struggle, victory declaring sometimes for one side and sometimes for the other. At length the barbarians from the north rushed down with such impetuosity, as to sweep away all opposition; and finally they made complete conquest of the western empire, and firmly planted

themselves upon its soil. This work had employed them about two hundred years ; and they fought with each other and with the eastern empire three hundred years longer. From the fourth to the ninth century, a space of five hundred years, Europe was a great field of strife and slaughter ; a valley of death, where was heard the confused noise of conflict, and were seen garments rolled in blood.

The Protestant Reformation was accompanied by savage and gigantic wars, which were brought to a close by the influence of Gustavus Adolphus, after a hundred years' continuance. Thus do historical events agree with the prophetic statements of Christ. And it could well be said, "ye shall hear of wars and rumors of wars. There shall be famines, pestilences, and earthquakes. And there shall be signs in the sun, in the moon, and in the stars ; on earth the distress of nations, with perplexities ; the sea and the waves thereof roaring, and men's hearts failing them for fear ; waiting for those things which are coming on the earth. And then shall appear the sign of the Son of man in heaven."

All these things were necessary. By them the way was opened for, and assistance given to the upbuilding of Christ's kingdom. The Jewish power was opposed to the Gospel ; therefore it must fall before that could rise. The Paganism of the Roman Empire must be cast down and its opposition rendered powerless before Christianity could be extended therein. And the barbarism of the Gothic nations must be purged out, their wild spirits tamed, and their minds enlight-

ened before they could receive the Gospel. The papal intolerance of modern Europe was so hostile to Protestantism, that it could only be overcome, and the latter established, by the power of the sword. Hence, Christ had said, "Think ye that I am come to send peace on the earth? I tell you nay; but rather division and the sword." Not that Christianity itself fostered the spirit of war; but the ignorance and iniquity of man was disturbed by its pure spirit, and came forth to oppose its progress. Thus wars, revolutions, and the agitation of the elements of human society have been, in some degree, instrumental in elevating Christianity to the place it now occupies. These, however, have not been the authorised and direct means, but only the incidental and indirect. The proper and direct means have been the promulgation of the Gospel by human agency; the inculcation of truth by precept and example; the ceaseless toil of Christian teachers; the zeal and suffering of martyrs; the persuasive power of love and self-sacrifice; the *miraculous* evidences of the *divinity* of *Christ's mission*. These instruments were sufficient to establish the Christian religion in Jerusalem and Samaria, in the very midst of Jewish violence and bigotry; they were employed in Western Asia, and in Southern Europe, until the Roman Empire bowed in reverence and submission before it; and among the rude nations of the middle ages have they operated till *they have wrought out the present civilization* of the Christian world. At first Christ came in the flesh, but not so was his coming in the events mentioned; this was in

spirit. His kingdom was not an outward organization of a civil and military character. He reigns through the medium of the doctrine which he taught and the spirit which he imparted. This we conceive to be the proper interpretation of the second advent of Christ. In no other sense can the details be made to harmonize with the facts. In this sense his second coming can be called powerful and glorious.

This coming of Christ in his kingdom is termed, by the inspired writers, "the last day or the last days." And according to the prophet, these last days or these times of the Messiah, were to be seasons of vast moral and religious improvement. He says, "And it shall come to pass in the *last days*, that the mountain of the Lord's house shall be established in the tops of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the Lord, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths; for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the Lord from Jerusalem. And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plough shares, and their spears into pruning hooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more." Isaiah 2: 2—4. That this language has reference to the reign of the Messiah none will doubt; and that the "*last days*" here mentioned, relate to the Gospel day, the day when Christ should come in "his kingdom with power and

great glory," is evident from the following language of St. Paul: "God, who at sundry times, in divers manners, spake in times past unto the fathers by the prophets, hath in these *last days* spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom he also made the worlds. Hebrews 1 : 1, 2. See also verses 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8. We are to understand, then, by the phrase "*last day*," not the end of the world, or the time of the closing up of all earthly things, but rather the times of the Messiah's reign — the Gospel day or dispensation. It is equivalent to the *last times*—*the last ages* — *the world to come*—*the coming of Christ in his kingdom*.

There were connected with the dawn and advancement of this "*last day*," or with the rise and progress of Christ's kingdom, several particulars, which demand a very careful consideration as we pass along.

According to the Scriptures, the Old Covenant was to be destroyed at or near the commencement of the "*last days*," or the reign of Christ; and it is described by the apostle Peter in that bold and metaphorical style which characterises the writings of the prophets. He says, "Knowing this first, that there shall come in the *last days* scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying were is the promise of his coming? for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of the creation. For this they are willingly ignorant of, that by the word of God the heavens were of old, and the earth standing out of the water, and in the water, whereby the world that then was, being

overflowed with water, perished ; but the heavens and the earth which are now, by the same word are kept in store, reserved unto fire against the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. But, beloved, be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day. The Lord is not slack concerning his promise, as some men count slackness ; but is long suffering to us ward, not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance. But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night ; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ; the earth, also, and the works that are therein, shall be burned up. Seeing, then, that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for, and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat ? (2 Peter 3 : 3—12.)

The opinion has extensively prevailed that this language has direct reference to the destruction of the material universe. But that this opinion is not well founded, a few remarks and references will show. The prophet Joel uses similar language, which Peter, in the second chapter of Acts, applies to events transpiring on the earth, at the time he spoke. On the day of Pentecost, the apostles preached to an audience made up of men from all nations, and there was a mighty outpouring of the

spirit, and every man heard in his own language, and they were astonished and said what meaneth these things? and some replied that those who had been speaking to them were full of new wine. But Peter stood up and denied this, and on the contrary said, "This is that which was spoken by the prophet Joel, and it shall come to pass in the *last day*, saith God, I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams; * * * * and I will show wonders in heaven above, and signs in the earth beneath; blood and fire, and vapor of smoke; the sun shall be turned into darkness, and the moon into blood, before that great and notable day of the Lord come." Acts 2: 16, 17, 19, 20. We are evidently not to understand this language literally. It does not teach the destruction of the literal heavens and earth; for Peter assures us that it was fulfilled in his day, and yet the earth, the sun and the moon, remain undisturbed. But read the language of Isaiah in relation to the destruction of Idumea. "And all the hosts of heaven shall be dissolved, and the heavens shall be rolled together as a scroll: and all their hosts shall fall down, as the leaf falleth off from the vine, as a falling fig from a fig tree. For my sword shall be bathed in heaven: behold it shall come down upon Idumea, and upon the people of my curse, to judgment." Isaiah 34: 4, 5. The events here described by the prophet were long since consummated; yet the material universè has not been

destroyed. Much more to the same purpose might be quoted, but this is sufficient to show that Peter, in the passage under consideration, might use very strong language, as did the prophets, and not intend to describe the destruction of the material world. And a more close observation of his language will confirm this fact. He begins the passage under review, by saying that what he was about to describe would take place in the "last days;" and so did the very similar language which he quoted from Joel set forth what would come to pass at the last day; yet he declares it to have been fulfilled in the day of Pentecost, eighteen hundred years ago.

Let it be farther noticed that the apostle Peter, in the third chapter of his second epistle, in the fifth, sixth and seventh verses, mentions two worlds: 1. The *old* one, which had perished by water, and, 2. That of the then present time, which was to be consumed by fire. Then in the thirteenth verse, he announces a third world, to succeed the destruction of the last; *according to his promise, we look for a new heavens and a new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness*. It is not the visible heavens, and the material earth, of which the apostle treats in either passage; because the old world of which he speaks had been already destroyed by water, and yet the material heavens, together with the material earth, still remained. By that *world*, therefore, must be understood, *mankind* living in the world. They having been destroyed by the deluge, there was founded another *world*, for the proper observance of

the worship of God. The foundation of this world God placed in the family of Noah ; but the whole fabric was completed by the organization of the Jewish Church, (or by the making of the old covenant.) And this was the world which Peter, in that passage, predicted, according to the prophetic style, should be destroyed by fire. To this purport, we read in Isaiah 51 : 15, 16, "I am *the Lord thy God, that divided the sea whose waves roared ; the Lord of hosts is his name. And I have put my words in thy mouth, and have covered thee in the shadow of my hand, that I may plant the heavens, and lay the foundations of the earth, and say unto Zion, thou art my people.*

At the time, therefore, when God, *dividing the sea, and leading forth his people out of Egypt*, entrusted to them his word or his law, with the solemn appointment of his worship, thus forming them into a church for himself, then it was that he instituted and finished *this new world, the heavens and the earth* spoken of. And at the time when Peter wrote, this world, that is, the Jewish church now apostatized, was about to be destroyed by fire, after the same manner in which that old world had perished in the deluge. It was by the conflagration of the temple and of the city, that the system of that world was dissolved. At which time the most terrible judgments fell upon the Jewish nation and upon Jews every where,—calamities such as had never fallen upon any nation before, came upon them, and they were carried captives among all nations, to be

a hissing and a bye-word even to this day. (But after the destruction of this old world or old covenant) the apostle commands the believers to look for another world, for a new heavens and a new earth, according to the promise of God. That promise is found in Isaiah 65: 17, and likewise, in the same words, in chap. 66: 22. "*Behold,*" says he, "*I will create new heavens and a new earth, neither shall the former be remembered, nor come into mind.*" In these passages, the prophet describes the state of the church after the advent of Christ, when, as it is expressed in the 21st verse of the last chapter, God should take of the Gentiles for priests and Levites, or, in other words, when he should institute the Gospel ministry. This state of the church, (or of the Gospel kingdom) was, therefore, wont to be designated, before the conflagration of that second world, as the age to come, or the future world; even as St. Paul teaches us, in the epistle to the Hebrews, 2: 5, saying, "*For unto the angels hath he not put in subjection the world to come, of which we speak;* and likewise in chap. 6: 5, where he says, "*And have tasted the good word of God, and the powers of the world to come.* Therefore that *first* or *old* world perished by a deluge of water; the *second*, or that existing in the apostle's time, he declares should perish by fire; but the future, he intimates, was to endure even to the consummation of time."*

The last day, or the time of the Messiah's reign, is spoken of, by the New Testament writers, as a

* Owen, as found in Paige's Selections, p. 283.

resurrection day, or as a time when the morally dead should be raised to life. Hence, says the apostle, (Ephesians 5: 14,) "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light." But let us be careful, here, lest we stumble, as the world has generally stumbled, on this subject. A want of caution, or something worse, has cast a cloud of confusion and error over nearly every feature of the doctrine of immortality. The resurrection, which is spoken of as belonging exclusively to and connected with the operations of the last day, is produced by faith; and I suppose few, if any, will pretend that our resurrection to immortality depends upon or is the result of faith. The general opinion is, that all men will be raised to immortality, whether they believe or not;—yet the following passage is supposed, by many who entertain this opinion, to relate to the immortal resurrection state: "And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the *last day*. And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the *last day*." John 6: 39, 40. Mr. Paige says, in his comments on this passage, "that a resurrection to immortality, at some time, is distinctly intimated" here. If so, then it is just as distinctly intimated that this resurrection will be the result of faith. Faith is a contingency, the want of which will prevent any individual from being raised

to immortality. But I would ask Mr. Paige, or any other man, whether he is prepared to admit this conclusion ; and if so, whether he is not prepared to admit, also, that all unbelievers will be annihilated ; or, at least, will not be raised from the dead ? But without farther delay, let us compare the passage before us, with what is said elsewhere in the New Testament, and I think we shall be convinced that it has reference to a moral or spiritual resurrection, and not to immortality. Saith Paul to the Ephésians, “ But God, who is rich in mercy, for his great love wherewith he loved us, even when we were *dead* in sins, hath quickened us together with Christ ; (by grace ye are saved,) and hath *raised* us up together and made us sit together in heavenly places in Christ Jesus ; that in the ages to come,” (or in the last days) “ he might show the exceeding riches of his grace in his kindness towards us through Christ Jesus.” Here is, plainly, a resurrection from a death in sin ; and the language employed to describe it is similar to that found in the passage under consideration ; the similarity of sentiment is also obvious. In the one place it is said, “ And I will raise him up at the last day ;” in the other it is said, “ Hath raised us up,” “ who were dead in sin,” “ that in the ages to come,” (which is equivalent to last day,) “ he might show the exceeding riches of his grace.” Again ; Christ uses language precisely to the point : “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that heareth my word, and believeth on him that sent me, hath everlasting life, and shall not come into condemnation ; but is

passed from death unto life." All will doubtless admit that this refers wholly to the spiritual change or resurrection wrought in believers, by the power of the Gospel, in this life. St. Paul had reference to the same sort of a resurrection in the following language, "And be found in him, not having mine own righteousness which is of the law, but that which is through the faith of Christ, the righteousness which is of God by faith; that I may know him, and the power of his resurrection, and the fellowship of his sufferings, being made conformable unto his death; if by any means I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead. Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect; but I follow after, if that I may apprehend that for which also I am apprehended of Christ Jesus." (Philippians 3: 9—13.) See also John 6: 44. And this kind of a resurrection is always spoken of as being the result of faith in Jesus Christ, followed by good works; but not so with the resurrection to immortality; hence the conclusion that the resurrection, spoken of in the passages introduced under this head, is a moral or spiritual resurrection, which is continually going on in this world, and will continue to go on, as long as Christ shall continue to reign in his kingdom here.

The last or gospel day is said in the Scriptures to be a judgment day. Thus we read—"And so much the more as ye see the day approaching;" "reserved unto fire against the day of judgment;" "the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night;" "the

same shall judge him in the last day ;” “so shall it be in the end of the world ;” “I charge thee, therefore, before God, and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and kingdom.” “Therefore, judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come, who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness, and will make manifest the counsels of the heart : and then shall every man have praise of God.” If we now turn to those passages which describe the second coming of Christ and the establishment of his kingdom, we shall find it made very plain that one object of his reign was to dispense judgment. “When the Son of man shall come in his glory, and all the holy angels with him, then shall he sit upon the throne of his glory ; and before him shall be gathered all nations : and he shall separate them one from another, as a shepherd divideth his sheep from the goats ; and he shall set the sheep on his right hand, but the goats on the left.” (Matt. 25 : 31—33.) “For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father with his angels ; and then shall he reward every man according to his works.” Verily I say unto you, there be some standing here, which shall not taste of death, till they see the Son of man coming in his kingdom.” (Matt. 16 : 27, 28.) In Luke 19 : 11—27, Christ compares himself to a nobleman who went into a far country *to receive for himself a kingdom*, and to return. “And it came to pass, that when he was returned, *having received the kingdom*,” he sat in judgment on the doings of

his servants, and rendered to every man according as his works had been. So in Daniel 7: 10. The judgment was set and the books were opened.* * * One like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven; * * * and there was given him a kingdom. * * * It was when Christ received the kingdom, that he commenced his mediatorial reign, that the judgment was set and the books were opened. Then he began to rule and reign and judge; and he will thus continue to do, throughout the last day. But it may be asked, how will he thus judge? He has answered this question in these words: "He that rejecteth me, and receiveth not my words, hath one that judgeth him: the word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the *last day*." (John 12: 48.)

That the reign of the Messiah was to be a resurrection and judgment day seems clearly taught in the following: "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man. Marvel not at this: for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good, unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation." (John 5: 27, 28, 29.) That this language has been employed to prove a literal resurrection and that there will be a retribution in the future state, few can be ignorant. But a fact or two will show that it proves nothing of the kind. The general opinion is, that when men die, they go immediately to the spirit-world, and are there judged according to their deserts

and are sent to heaven or hell, as the case may be. But the resurrection is to be simultaneous and at some future time, when all that are in the graves shall come forth ; “they that have done good unto the resurrection of life ; and they that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation.” Now the question is, What will come forth ? Why, that which is in the graves. Well, what is in the graves ? If anything is there, it is the bodies of those who have died, and nothing but the bodies ; for the spirits of all the dead went immediately at death to the world of spirits ; and were there judged and sent to their respective places of abode, — yet the resurrection had not taken place. There is nothing in the graves but dead bodies or their dust, and nothing else can come out. Then all the bodies that have done good will come forth to the resurrection of life, and all that have done evil unto the resurrection of damnation ! Nothing can be more absurd than such views : for we have shown in a preceding chapter that the body, in itself considered, is not a moral agent ; and morally speaking, it is not capable of distinguishing between good and evil, any more than the brute beast, or the senseless rock. It cannot therefore be properly said to have done either good or evil.

Let us take another view of the matter. All will doubtless admit that the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses refer to a moral or spiritual resurrection, about to take place, when Christ uttered the language composing them. Notice then the fact that

the words, rendered *good* and *damnation* in the twenty-ninth verse, are of the same import of those in the twenty-fourth verse, rendered *believeth* and *condemnation*. Hence Lightfoot makes the twenty-eighth and twenty-ninth verses refer to the same spiritual resurrection mentioned in the twenty-fourth and twenty-fifth verses ; and of course, those that are styled *the dead*, in the twenty-fifth verse, are the same as those who are said to be in the graves, in the twenty-eighth verse. The sense then may be expressed thus : they that do good after they hear Christ's voice in the gospel, shall come forth to the resurrection of life and peace ; and they that do evil after they hear the gospel, unto the resurrection of condemnation and misery. It may be objected, that Jesus meant by those in the graves, the literally dead, simply because the word graves is used, and that their resurrection must be to immortality ; but the prophet Ezekiel uses similar phraseology in chapter 37 : 11—14, where he is evidently speaking of those morally and civilly dead.

In concluding this chapter, it may be observed that there is nothing very strange in the fact that theologians should imagine that there would be a simultaneous resurrection and a general judgment, at the end of time, or at the end of the world, seeing they believed that the second advent of Christ would then take place. Had they supposed that Christ came at the end of the old covenant or Jewish dispensation, and that he would rule and judge throughout his mediatorial reign, we should have

heard little of a general judgment at the end of time. And it is passing strange that those who disbelieve in the general judgment should hold to a general or simultaneous resurrection; to be consistent, they ought to believe in the one as much as in the other; for we have seen that the judgment day and the resurrection day are the same. They both, however, belong, as we have seen, to the Gospel day, the last day, or the reign of the Messiah.

CHAPTER IX.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT SCRIPTURES.

IN examining those passages, relating to the doctrine of the resurrection, found in the New Testament, it seems necessary to introduce one from the writings of the apostle Paul, first; for it is so closely interwoven with the principles of the second advent that it ought to be placed in connection with the examination of that doctrine. Paul had been most faithful in his great office; his experience had been wonderful and his fortune varied; and when near the end of his earthly pilgrimage, as he supposed, he gave Timothy some very pointed instruction in relation to his duty; and in the following language presented his own deportment and expectations.

II. TIMOTHY 4: 5—8. "But watch thou in all things; endure afflictions, do the work of an evangelist, make full proof of thy ministry. For I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand. I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith. Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that day: and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his appearing."

The popular view of this is, that Paul expected to receive his crown at some future period, in the immortal world, after a general resurrection and judgment had taken place. If we consider three particulars contained in this passage we shall find that the apostle expected no such thing. These particulars relate to the faith which he had kept, the fight which he had fought, and the crown which he expected to receive.

"I have kept the faith." What are we to understand by this declaration? Are we not to understand, that Paul had continued steadfast in the belief of some truth, which was communicated to him, while on his way to Damascus? Was not his faith grounded upon his convictions of the fact, that Christ was the true Messiah, the sent of God, the appointed medium through which He designed to bring the world of mankind, to the knowledge of the truth, to the practice of righteousness, and to the enjoyment of salvation? This was doubtless the faith which Paul kept. For this faith he labored and suffered reproach. Those who were destitute of it were exceeding mad with him for having believed and preached it. A warfare was commenced against him when he renounced Phariseism; and therefore he was obliged to strive and toil incessantly during his ministry, suffering all sorts of persecution and reproach; but he "kept the faith," and when his departure drew nigh, he was resigned and peaceful. He relied upon the grace of God, and not upon his own strength; and he could meet all the buffet-

ings of the world with joy and wait God's appointed time with patience.

Paul not only kept the faith, but he "*fought a good fight.*" It was a good fight which he fought, because the weapons of his warfare were not carnal, but spiritual and mighty to the pulling down of the strong holds of sin and ignorance. He went forth to the combat, armed in the spirit of truth and love. He was met by the evil passions and wicked devices of men; he was scourged and reviled, proscribed and misrepresented; and how differently does he now conduct from what he did when he was Saul of Tarsus! Instead of returning blow for blow and injury for injury, he strives to overcome evil with good and to destroy his enemies by making them friends. He had received the spirit of Christ and the truth of heaven into his soul; he had thus learned that his adversaries were children of God, and with himself, heirs of immortal felicity; and that when the blood of Christ, which cleanseth from all sin, should accomplish its perfect work, their malignity and wickedness would be no more. Therefore he endeavored to touch their hearts with the same spirit which had transformed his own, by setting before them the doctrine, precepts, example, death, and resurrection of his Master.

This was a glorious warfare; and the apostle fought a good fight indeed. He exhibited a courage in this moral battle, more sublime than all that earthly conquerors have ever displayed. It was the courage of principle, which dares to hazard

reputation, rank, the prospects of advancement, the sympathy of friends, the admiration of the world, rather than violate a conviction of duty. This kind of courage infinitely transcends all physical courage ; for it is the exercise, result, and expression of the highest attributes of human nature. It stimulated Paul to fight a good fight — to fight with the weapons of truth and love for human happiness, improvement and virtue ; and it did not quail before the most imminent danger. And if any of earth's great warriors deserve to have their names written high on the scroll of fame and to be crowned with honor, how much more so does St. Paul ! For is not a courage, which urges men on to deliver their fellows from the thralldom of sin and every blighting curse, by the exercise of love and the defence of truth, at the hazard of all earthly aggrandizement, more glorious than that courage which urges them on to drench the earth in blood, and tears, and to rear monuments of carnage, ruin and distress, merely to gratify a selfish ambition, a love of power and worldly distinction ? Yet few, who have been, and are now, renowned for their military prowess and deeds of valor, have been influenced by higher motives than the gratification of a selfish ambition. But the love of truth and righteousness induced St. Paul to fight the good fight of philanthropy, though death stared him in the face ; and therefore he deserves to occupy a high place in our soul's reverence, and to receive the admiration of our noblest powers.

For having kept the faith, and having fought a good fight, Paul expected to receive a crown of righteousness. But when did the apostle expect to receive this crown? He says, "Henceforth there is laid up for me a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous Judge, shall give me at that *day*." At "*that day*," then, the crown was to be given him. To what day did he refer? It is evident that when the apostle uses the phrase *that day*, he refers to a day or an event, of which he had previously spoken. Were this not the case, neither Timothy nor any one else would be able to understand him. By looking at the first of the chapter from which this passage is taken, we have the day or event specified in these words; "I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the quick and the dead at his appearing and his kingdom." When Christ appeared in his kingdom Paul received his crown; and we have seen in a previous chapter that this took place during the lifetime of some of his disciples. And all will now admit, I suppose, that Christ came in glory and power to establish his spiritual kingdom on the earth, during the apostolic age. At that time, Paul received an honorable place in the kingdom and was crowned a ruler, subordinate only to the King himself, and participated in the honors due all those who had been faithful soldiers in the Christian warfare. The declaration that Christ was to "judge the quick and the dead at his appearing," does not militate against this view; for some of this character were *living* on the earth

in the days of the apostle. He says to the Ephesians,—“And you hath he quickened, who were dead in trespasses and sins: wherein in times past ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the power of the prince of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience. * * * * Even (God) when we were dead in sins hath quickened us together with Christ.” Eph. 2: 1, 2.

The sum of the whole matter seems to be this: As a nobleman who spends his strength, his knowledge, and his treasures, in assisting a prince to obtain a kingdom and to establish his kingly authority therein, receives a high station in the government of the kingdom, and is crowned with honor according to his merit,—so Paul, who had “fought a good fight” for the King of Zion, suffered reproach in his cause, and exercised much power in the establishment of His authority and reign, expected to be promoted to a station in the kingdom according to his merit, and to be crowned with the honors due his services. This position is proved by the language of Christ himself. He says, “Verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.” (Matt. 19: 28.) But as the kingdom of Christ was to be a spiritual kingdom and was not to have a visible throne or king, so Paul’s honor and authority was to be spiritual, “The twelve tribes of Israel,” mentioned in the pas-

sage just quoted, must be deemed, according to St. James, a kind of figured or prophetic designation of the Christian Church, or Messiah's kingdom, in the midst of which the apostles are to be conceived as enthroned, their deeds and virtues honored, and their writings and doctrines regarded as authority in matters of faith and practice.

Professor Bush, after proving that the word *Judge* in the Scriptures embraces the idea of a *ruler*, says, "In all these passages, which are but specimens of multitudes of others of a similar import, we read the clear pre-intimations of one grand character of the Messiah's reign. It was to be a dispensation of judgment; even as Christ says himself,—“The Father hath given him *authority to execute judgment.*” And again, “The Father *judgeth* no man, but hath committed all judgment to the Son.” (John 5 : 22.) As then the setting up of the kingdom of the Son of man was, in fact, the commencement of this grand process of *judgment*, which was to run parallel with its duration; therefore, our Lord, in immediate prospect of that important era, declares, “Now is the judgment of this world; now is the Prince of this world cast out;” (John 12 : 31,) that is, this judgment is just upon the eve of entering on its accomplishment. * * * * His second coming commenced with that new order of things which is, in the main, to be dated from the destruction of Jerusalem, when the *session* of judgment had its beginning, which is to be considered as continuing through the whole period of the dispensation.

In this *judicial administration* it is, moreover, the clear teaching of both Testaments that the saints were to share with Christ. Enoch prophesied, "Behold the Lord cometh with myriads of his saints to execute judgment upon all." David says, "that to execute the judgment written is an honor which all the saints are to have." Isaiah also says, "Behold, a King shall reign in righteousness, and a Prince shall rule in judgment." Thus, too, in the passage already quoted from Daniel, "judgment was given to the saints of the Most High," and upon this is the express declaration of Paul, that "the saints shall judge the world." Nothing else than this is implied in Revelations, where it is said of the saints that overcome, that they shall "have power over the nations, and they shall rule them with a rod of iron; as the vessels of a potter shall they dash them to pieces."*

If this be correct, as we have no doubt it is, we need not wonder that St. Paul should expect, after having fought his battles in the cause of Christ, to have his name written high on the records of the Church. It is not strange that he should expect to receive an honorable station in the kingdom of Christ, when he had labored so faithfully and ardently to establish it in the earth. It is not marvellous that he should expect to be crowned with authority, to exercise a righteous judgment there, by his virtues, his example and his writings.

A passage very similar to this is found in Philip-
pians 3: 20, 21. "For our conversation is in heaven;

* *Bash on the Resurrection*, p. 183.

from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall change our vile body, that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body, according to the working whereby he is able even to subdue all things unto himself." That the vile body, here mentioned, was to be changed at the coming of Christ in his kingdom, and not at the time when it is supposed a general resurrection will take place, is evident from the first part of the text, which reads, "our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ;" and the New Testament says nothing about Christ's coming in any way or at any time except in his kingdom. The early disciples looked with a great deal of solicitude for the second appearance of Christ ; for then they expected to be delivered from persecution, and their low and despised condition ; they had been considered propagators of falsehood, and they hoped then to have their characters vindicated and the truth of their cause fully established. This view the passage just quoted sustains. It should however be noticed that the apostle does not say that Christ would change "*vile bodies*," but "*vile body*," which was the church : for the apostle has told us in other places that the *church* is the *body* of Christ ; and it should be farther noticed that the word rendered *vile* would better express the meaning of the original were it rendered *lowly* or humble body. Hence the passage would read thus : "For our conversation is in heaven ; from whence also we look for the Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ ; who shall

change our humble or lowly body that it may be fashioned like unto his glorious body," as seen on the mount of Transfiguration, without spot or wrinkle; that is, the reproach which men had heaped upon the church should be wholly removed, and it should stand forth before the world in all its glory.

MATTHEW 10: 28. And fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill the soul: but rather fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell.

This text is supposed to teach very plainly the doctrine of a future retribution. The word "destroy" is not usually understood in its broadest sense; it is supposed to indicate torment rather than literal destruction; therefore it is maintained that the passage teaches that God is able to punish or inflict misery upon the souls and bodies of sinners in hell, rather than that he will positively *destroy* them there. It is very plain that the soul and body are to suffer in one and the same place, whatever may be meant by the term *destroy*; and if the word hell represents a place of misery in the eternal world, it is very certain that the body must be raised from the dead before it can be destroyed there. Therefore, unless the passage be fulfilled in the immortal world, it yields no support to the doctrine of the resurrection of the material body; and there are a number of considerations, that preclude the possibility of its affording the least proof of such a doctrine. Some of these I will now lay before the reader, hoping they will be satisfactory.

The word in the text, rendered hell, is *Gehenna*. Now the question seems to be, did Christ ever represent by this word a place of misery in the immortal world? If so, in all probability, the apostles would afterwards have used it thus in their writings; but the truth is, in all their epistles, they have never intimated that *Gehenna* is the name of a place of torment in the eternal world. Moreover, Christ said to his disciples, in the context: "What I tell you in darkness, that speak in light; and what ye hear in the ear, that preach ye upon the house-tops." Did the apostles ever preach that *Gehenna* was located in the immortal world? No, never; so far as our knowledge extends, they are silent on the subject. The word is not found in the Acts of the apostles, and is used but once in all their epistolary writings. In this instance, it has reference to things of time and not of eternity, as all will doubtless admit. Hence one of two things must be true; either the apostles did not obey the commands of Christ — did not do their duty, or else they did not understand him to mean that *Gehenna* was the name of a place, situated in eternity, where the souls and bodies of men were in danger of being destroyed. Here is a dilemma, either horn of which will prove troublesome to the advocates of endless misery.

Gehenna was the name of a pleasant valley situated a short distance from Jerusalem. In this beautiful vale was erected the brazen idol, called *Moloch*; upon which the Jews not only offered beasts and fowls, but *their children*, also. Jeremiah calls this place

Tophet, because the priests beat drums to drown the shrieks of the children that were sacrificed by fire, during seasons of worship. (Jer. 7 : 31.) When king Josiah abolished this horrid practice, and the Jews had returned to the worship of God, they so detested this place, that they cast into it all the filth of Jerusalem, the carcasses of dead animals, and the bodies of criminals, who had been put to death for capital offences. The collection of animal matter was, of course, always covered with worms and putrefaction ; and to prevent the atmosphere from becoming infected, and thus destructive to health, a fire was continually kept burning to consume the offal. Therefore, in the process of time, all severe punishment, the death of criminals, and the calamities which God sent upon the wicked, were called Gehenna judgments. This is confirmed by the following language of Jeremiah : “Therefore, behold the day is come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, (Gehenna) but the valley of slaughter ; for they shall bury in Tophet till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of heaven, and for the beasts of the earth ; and none shall fray them away. Then will I cause to cease from the cities of Judah, and from the streets of Jerusalem, the voice of mirth, and the voice of gladness, the voice of the bridegroom, and the voice of the bride ; for the land shall be desolate.” Jeremiah 7 : 32, 33, 34.

That a Gehenna judgment, or the damnation of Gehenna, was about to be executed upon the Jewish

nation, when the language of the text was uttered, is evident from the following declaration of Christ: "Wherefore ye be witnesses unto yourselves, that ye are the children of them which killed the prophets. Fill ye up, then, the measure of your fathers. Ye serpents, ye generation of vipers, how can ye escape the damnation of hell? (Gehenna.) Wherefore, behold I send unto you prophets, and wise men, and scribes; and some of them shall ye scourge in your synagogues, and persecute from city to city: that upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel, unto the blood of Zacharias, son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar. Verily I say unto you, all these things shall come upon this generation. Behold your house is left unto you desolate." Matt. 23: 31 — 38. The men of the generation then living were to experience this damnation of Gehenna. It was to come upon them, as we learn from the next chapter, when Christ should make his second appearance. At that time, war, pestilence, and famine, would make desolate the land of Judah. In Matthew, the tenth chapter, we learn that Christ's second coming was not very far distant when he uttered the language of the text. He says to his disciples, after commanding them to go and preach to the lost sheep of the house of Israel: "And ye shall be hated of all men for my name sake: but he that endureth to the end shall be saved. But when they persecute you in this city, flee ye into another; for verily I say unto you, ye shall not have gone over the cities of Israel

till the Son of man be come." This settles the matter as to *time*. "But he that endureth to the end shall be saved." Saved from what? Why, from the Gehenna destruction that was to come upon the Jewish nation, before the disciples had gone over the cities of Israel. Hence it is plain, that the design of Christ, in this tenth chapter of Matthew, was to point out to his disciples the difficulties they would have to encounter, while pursuing the object of their ministry — to encourage them to be faithful — to warn them against apostacy — to exhibit to them the means by which they could avoid many evils — and to show them the consequence of disobedience to his commands. Let us look at these items a moment. The disciples were commanded by Christ to go forth and preach to the lost sheep of the house of Israel, "Saying the kingdom of heaven is at hand." Then they were given to understand that they were going among enemies, who were cruel as devouring wolves, and who would maliciously bring them before governors and kings, accusing them of evil in the most bitter spirit of hatred. To escape this as much as possible, they were commanded to "be wise as serpents and harmless as doves." Finally they were exhorted not to fear their adversaries, but to speak what they had learned, in the most prominent places and in the plainest manner; for God, who takes notice of the sparrow, and provides it with all necessary good, would sustain them, provide for their wants, and bring them off more than conquerors. But if they were so fearful of their persecutors as to prove recreant,

if they should succumb to the enemies of their Master, and renounce him before the world, God would certainly destroy them with their Jewish brethren, who were then standing upon the very brink of ruin. "Fear them not, therefore," says the Master, "for they can only kill the body;" *but rather fear God who is able to bring upon you judgments that will destroy both soul and body.*

In what sense would God destroy the souls and bodies of apostate disciples? Before answering this question, it is necessary to make a remark or two on the word rendered *soul* in the text. This word, without doubt, in the New Testament, often signifies life; but there are a number of instances where it seems to be synonymous with *soul or mind*. In the following, to my understanding, it means something more than animal life. Matt. 12: 18, "In whom my *soul* is well pleased." 22: 27, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart and with all thy *soul*." Acts 14: 32, "Were of one heart and one *soul*." 14: 2, "Made their *minds* evil-affected against the brethren." 14: 22, "Confirming the *souls* of the disciples." Eph. 6: 6, "Doing the will of God from the heart." Phil. 1: 27, "Stand fast in one spirit, with one *mind*." Heb. 4: 19, "which hope we have as an anchor to the *soul*." Matt. 11: 29, "Learn of me: for I am meek and lowly in heart, and ye shall find rest unto your *souls*." Christ did not mean by this, that he would give rest to the bodies of those that came to him, or to their animal life; but he meant that he would give rest to

their weary, troubled spirits. The apostle, obviously, did not design to say that a Gospel hope was an anchor to the bodies of men ; but we understand him to mean that the hope of the Gospel is an anchor to the *soul*. Neither do we understand Christ to say in the text that God would destroy merely the lives and bodies of apostate disciples, but that he would destroy both their souls and bodies in hell. In what sense would he destroy their souls ? Nearly in the same sense that he would destroy their bodies. In what sense would he destroy their bodies ? In the same sense that men were able to destroy their bodies. Were men able to annihilate the body ? No ; they could only destroy the *life* of the body. They had no power to strike the body out of existence. They had power to destroy the life of the body, but the soul they could not injure. Therefore the disciples were exhorted not to fear men. They were told to fear God, who was able to destroy the life, both of the soul and the body ; and this he would do when the impending judgments fell upon their enemies, if they thought to save themselves from the martyr's fate, by abandoning the work their Master had given them to do. It should be remembered that Jesus was about sending his disciples out to preach the Gospel of the kingdom, when he uttered the language of the passage under consideration. He informed them that they would be persecuted and arraigned before magistrates, where their lives would be in peril ; but he tells them not to fear, not to be anxious or thoughtful about what they should say ; for the spirit of God

would be in them and enable them to speak as the case might demand. Moreover, Christ promised his disciples that they should receive strength and support in their trials, which should enable them to triumph over all ; and according to this promise, they received the comforter, or spirit of truth, which communicated such a life and energy to their souls as to enable them to meet persecution and death with calmness and joy. Hence they could understand and appreciate Christ's meaning, when he said, "If a man keep my saying, he shall never see death ;" and "whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die." Of course, it is not meant that such should not die a natural death, but that death should have no power over their souls. There grew up within them a life-sustaining power.

St. Paul represents that those who were filled with the spirit could look upon all outward calamity and affliction as mere trifles — as having no power to disturb their happiness. On this account, he affirms that nothing should induce him to abandon the cause of Christ. He asks, "Who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Shall tribulation, or distress, or persecution, or famine, or nakedness, or peril, or sword? (As it is written, for thy sake we are killed all the day long ; we are accounted as sheep for the slaughter.) Nay, in all these things we are more than conquerors, through him that loved us. For I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is

in Christ Jesus our Lord." "In this language," says Dr. Clark, "the apostle is referring to the persecutions and tribulations to which genuine Christians were exposed, through their attachment to Christ, and the gracious provision God had made for their support and final salvation. As in this provision, God had shown his infinite love to them in providing Jesus Christ, as their sin-offering; and Jesus Christ had shown his love in suffering death upon the cross for them; so here he speaks of the love of followers of God, to that Christ who had first loved them. Therefore, the question is not, who shall separate the love of Christ from us? or prevent Christ from loving us? but the apostle asks, who shall separate us from the love of Christ? Who or what shall induce us to apostatize? And the answer is — nothing; neither tribulation, nor persecution, nor death, shall induce us to abandon Christ; for his truth has communicated a glory and life to our souls, which enables us to triumph over all adversity. This sustaining spirit was necessary to sustain the life of the soul; and whenever it should be taken away, of course, the soul would die. Its elements would not die or become extinct, but simply its power to live calmly and peacefully, in the midst of the severest outward inflictions, would be destroyed.

Here, then, is the conclusion of the whole matter. Christ, in the tenth chapter of Matthew, labors to impress the fact upon the minds of his disciples, that if they renounced his cause through fear of their adversaries, and should attempt to save their lives by agreeing with them, God would certainly involve

them in the Gehenna destruction, that was about to fall upon the Jews, and would also deprive them of the life-giving power which obedience to his commands communicates to the soul, and which would enable all the faithful to stand up with fortitude against all outward calamity and persecution, and to rejoice even in death.

The Gospel is said to be the bread and water of life ; but it is not that bread and water which sustains the life of the body. It is the nutriment which sustains the life of the soul, and arms it against all outward inflictions. Ever since the days of the apostles, therefore, men have felt that the Gospel contains a life-giving power. Many have felt that the soul, imbued with the spirit of Christ, is mightier than all the elements of outward evil. Says Dr. Channing, " I have read of holy men, who, in days of persecution, have been led to the stake to pay the penalty of their uprightness, not in fierce and suddenly destroying flames, but in slow fire ; and though one retracting word would have snatched them from death, they have chosen to be burned ; and amidst the protracting agonies of limb burning after limb, they sought forgiveness for their enemies. What then are outward fires to the celestial flame within us ? And I do not feel as if God had ceased to love, as if man were forsaken of his Creator, because his body is scattered into ashes by fire. It would seem as if God intended to disarm the most terrible events of their power to disturb our faith, by making them the occasions of the sublimest virtues. In shipwrecks, we are furnished

with some of the most remarkable examples, that history affords, of trust in God, of unconquerable energy, and of tender, self-sacrificing love, making the devouring ocean the most glorious spot on earth. A friend, rescued from a wreck, told me that a company of pious Christians, who had been left in the sinking ship, were heard, from the boat in which he had found safety, lifting up their voices, not in shrieks or moans, but in a hymn to God, — thus awaiting, in a serene act of piety, the last, swift approaching hour. How much grander was that hymn than the ocean's roar! And what becomes of suffering when thus awakening into an energy, otherwise unknown, the highest sentiment of the soul?" Then persecution is nothing, death is nothing. But otherwise death is fearfully terrible; and well might Christ warn his disciples to be faithful, when he knew that if they were not, God would destroy the life of the soul, and then send upon them the judgments of Gehenna.

MATTHEW 5: 29, 30. And if thy right eye offend thee pluck it out and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell. And if thy right hand offend thee cut it off and cast it from thee; for it is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish and not that thy whole body should be cast into hell.

The parallel or corresponding passages are found in Matt. 18: 8, 9, and Mark 9: 43 — 48. If these passages refer to the future state at all, it is very certain that the body and the bodily organs will be raised

from the dead and exist there. But all will, doubtless, admit that the passages referred to, and the one we have quoted, correspond — that they are all of the same import, and set forth the same thing. It is also plain that the word “life” and the phrase “kingdom of God” are synonymous, and that the word perish, as used in this passage, only implies a negation of life. Hence we may remark, that these passages of Scripture are supposed to constitute a very strong proof of the endless suffering of some of the human family. But I am at a loss to know how any such sentiment could ever have gained credence among men; especially, if the passage, when understood, is adduced as the strongest evidence of its truth. If we give it a literal interpretation, a most palpable absurdity is involved. For if the word life, as found in some of the passages referred to, means a place of felicity in the immortal world, and hell a place of misery there, then those who die with an offending hand, foot, or eye, will go to hell, sound in their bodily organs; while, on the other hand, those who disencumber themselves of offending members will go to heaven with one hand, one eye, or one foot. To suppose the inhabitants of heaven to be thus mutilated, having but one eye, one hand, or one foot, is an idea which the common sense of most men would reject as absurd. Moreover, the question forces itself upon the mind, if the unoffending body goes to heaven because of its inoffensiveness, why not send the offending members to hell because of their offence? And again, why send the whole body to hell because the

hand or foot has offended? Why not send that part of the body, which has not given offence, to heaven, and that part to hell, which has? This would be a very strange doctrine to advocate. It would be very preposterous to teach that the bodies of men enjoy the felicity of heaven, while their eyes, hands, or feet, suffer the pains of hell. Yet this is a legitimate conclusion from the premises that the passage is to be construed literally, and as referring to the eternal world. I suppose, however, it will now be admitted that it is not to be understood literally, but allegorically, or metaphorically. By the hand, foot, and eye, we are to understand something besides the literal hand, eye, &c. These are only the materials by which something else is represented; and so of the whole passage; it is all to be understood metaphorically. It is not lawful to explain one part of a parable literally, and another part metaphorically. Yet in order to draw the doctrine of endless misery from the passages before us, this course has been pursued. Theologians have been unanimous in explaining them metaphorically, till they have come to the last part, or to the word hell. Here, they drop the metaphor and lay hold of the literal — making of hell a real locality in the immortal world, where the bodies of men are to be tormented with a literal fire. This is mingling the literal with the figurative in the most unwarrantable manner. Besides, there is no possible evidence that Christ had reference to the spirit-world when he uttered the language of the passage at the head of this chapter, and its parallels; but the language of them

all shows that he alludes to things of time. He evidently drew his figures from Jewish institutions, and almost borrows the language which the prophets had previously employed in describing things that existed and events that were to transpire in this world. In Jeremiah 7 : 31, and Isaiah 66 : 23, we find the following: "And they have built the high places of Tophet, which is in the valley of the son of Hinnom, (Gehenna, the word rendered hell in the text,) to burn their sons and their daughters in the fire; which I commanded them not, neither came it into my heart. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the son of Hinnom, but the valley of slaughter; for they shall bury in Tophet, till there be no place. And the carcasses of this people shall be meat for the fowls of the heaven, and for the beasts of the earth; and none shall fray them away." "And it shall come to pass that from one new moon to another, and from one Sabbath to another, that all flesh shall come to worship before me, saith the Lord. And they shall go forth, and look upon the carcasses of the men that have transgressed against me; for their worm shall not die, neither shall their fire be quenched; and they shall be an abhorring unto all flesh." How very similar to this is the language of Christ, when he says, "It is better for thee to enter into life maimed, than, having two hands, or two feet, to be cast into hell, (Gehenna, or the valley of the son of Hinnom,) where the worm dieth not and the fire is not quenched."

The metaphor was drawn from the fact that a

diseased limb is liable to infect the whole body, and finally to cause its death, or cause it to perish. To prevent this catastrophe, men were obliged to suffer the loss of the diseased member; and though the offending organs were as essential and valuable as an eye, an arm, or a foot, the privation had better be suffered than that the whole body should become loathsome and, on their account, perish and be cast into hell. (Gehenna.) This is the literal import of the passage, but we are not to understand it literally. It figures forth something else. And all will agree, I think, that by cutting off the hand or foot, or by plucking out the eye, we are to understand the Saviour as meaning that it is profitable to deprive ourselves of every thing, however dear and valuable in our sight, if calculated to entangle us in sinful practices, lest our whole moral system should become corrupt, loathsome and detestable, as the carcass of a criminal, thrown into Gehenna, the receptacle of filth and putrefaction. To a Jew nothing could be more horrible; hence the metaphor was fitly drawn and appropriately applied.

MATTHEW 27: 50 — 53. Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And behold the veil of the temple was rent in twain, from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city and appeared unto many.

This is a very remarkable passage, and at first

glance would seem to yield some evidence of the resurrection of the material body ; but closer observation must certainly convince any one, that little or no confidence can be placed in any hypothesis based upon it. Look at the peculiar structure of the passage and the phraseology employed in it : " Jesus, when he had cried again with a loud voice, yielded up the ghost. And behold the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom ; and the earth quaked, and the rocks rent ; and the graves opened ; and many *bodies* of the saints arose, *and came out of their graves after his resurrection*, and went into the holy city, (Jerusalem) and appeared unto many." Here it must be seen, that, though the graves were opened at the time Christ gave up the ghost, " and many bodies of the saints which slept arose," they did not come out of their graves and go into Jerusalem till after his resurrection, three days after they awoke. We are not told positively by the evangelist or any one else, whether they sat or stood upright in their graves during the three days that Christ was in the tomb, nor whether the saints *themselves* or their *bodies* went into the holy city. The inference, however, from our English version, is in favor of the idea that their bodies rose up from their sleeping postures, at the time of the crucifixion, and remained in their dark abode till after [Christ's resurrection, when they left them and went into the holy city. But where were the saints all this time ? and what was the object of the mission of their bodies to the city of Jerusalem ? and to whom did they appear ? What

become of these bodies after they appeared to many in the holy city? Did they then ascend to heaven, or did they go back to their graves and lay down in the places they formerly occupied, or did they ultimately find new tombs? Did they give any information concerning the spirit-world? or the time and process of the resurrection? Is it any where said in the Bible, that these bodies were brought out of their graves to show that the bodies of all men would be raised from the dead at some future period? We have no means of answering these questions in the affirmative. A thick cloud of mystery envelopes them. This is passing strange; for, certainly, if the events mentioned in the passage were designed to cast any light on the mode of man's future or immortal existence, they would not have been left so much obscured. The apostles have not referred to it in any of their writings; and Matthew is the only evangelist that records it. It is astonishing that events so astounding in their nature should be passed over so lightly and with so few observations, if they actually occurred according to the *popular interpretation*. One would naturally think that if this passage was intended to shed any light upon the doctrine of the resurrection, or would assist in explaining or defending the doctrine, they would have given it a prominent place in their teachings; and if the bodies of dead men were really re-animated and marched forth from their resting places, and exhibited themselves to many in Jerusalem, it is to be supposed the disciples would have seized upon the fact, and employed it as an invaluable argument

for the Messiahship of Christ. But this they have never done. And this should admonish us not to press the passage into the service of any theory. It should be consistently explained before it is adduced as proof of any doctrine ; but this will be a hard task, I fancy, and I know of no way of accomplishing it unless the following suggestion be correct.

The word translated *arose* may be defined thus :— to rise up from a state of recumbency or prostration, to be put in motion, to arouse, to stir up or excite, to be agitated, to revive from death, to leave the grave. It has indeed other definitions ; but these seem to be best suited to the circumstances connected with the use of the word. It is not, taking these circumstances into consideration, necessary to suppose that the bodies mentioned in the passage, actually revived from death or left their graves. Or, at least, there is nothing in the word *arose* that necessarily requires this supposition ; on the contrary, the circumstances of the case rather go to show that those bodies were only agitated or put in motion. For it is said that the “ earth did quake, and the rocks rent, and the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints *arose*.” Here it is as obvious as need be, that the rising or the commotion of the *bodies* was in close connection with the earthquake ; and it is not strange at all, that during a convulsion which rent the solid rocks asunder and shook the earth to its very centre, round about the holy city, the sepulchres in the vicinity of Jerusalem should be forced open, and that bodies of saints as well as others should be disturbed, and some of these

should be thrown into a sitting posture, and others cast out of their resting places, and made to stand almost erect against the wall ; while others, being cast from their niches on the sides of their dark dwelling, lay in confused masses below.

As the passage reads, it may be asked whether these bodies did not go forth from their graves and appear to many in Jerusalem after Christ's resurrection ? It is not certain that they did ; on the contrary there is a strong presumption against it. This will be apparent, if we consider that that part of the passage which we are now noticing, were it literally rendered, would read thus : " And the graves were opened, and many bodies of saints which slept arose, *and having come forth from their graves after his resurrection, they entered into the holy city and appeared unto many.*" Let it now be particularly observed that the word *somata*, rendered bodies, is in the neuter gender, while the participle, *exelthontes*, referring to the saints, is in the masculine. Why did the evangelist change the gender if he meant to be understood that those bodies were to be re-animated with life, and really appeared to many in the city of Jerusalem ? " Why do we not read, *exelthonta* instead of *exelthontes* ? These are points of very difficult solution, though liable to be overlooked by the mere reader of the English translation, which does not, because it could not, present the nicer shades of the original." *

That the " bodies " did not leave their graves and

* Bush on the Resurrection, p. 212.

go into the holy city, three days after they were brought to life, and there exhibit themselves, so as to be visible to the mortal eyes of many individuals, is further evident from the general meaning of the word translated *appeared*. This term properly implies the *manifestation of a spiritual being*, whether angel or departed spirit. For example, an angel *appeared* to Joseph, in a vision or dream, and warned him to flee into Egypt with his family. Matt. 2: 13. Hence we may legitimately infer that many of the saints, who had been wickedly put to death, appeared in vision, after it was known that Christ had arisen, to those whose hands were still red with their blood and whose minds were fearfully agitated by the events connected with the crucifixion and resurrection of Christ. We can easily imagine that these saints stood before the mental vision of their murderers, and shook at them their gory locks, till they were forced, as it were, to exclaim with guilty Macbeth,

“Blood hath been shed ere now, in the olden time
 Ere human statute purged the gentle weal;
 Ay, and since too, murders have been performed
 Too terrible for the ear: the times have been
 That, when the brains were out, the man would die
 And there an end: but now they rise again,
 With twenty mortal murders on their crowns,
 And push us from our stools.”

It is not strange that men, who had participated in scenes of violence and blood, who had persecuted and put to death the prophets and wise men that were sent by God to teach them truth and righteousness, and finally filled up their cup of iniquity by putting to death the Prince of life and glory; it is not strange

that such, after witnessing the fearful convulsions of nature which were manifest at Christ's crucifixion, and seeing the tombs of those whom they had murdered forced open, and viewing the agitation of their ghastly corpses,— should, after hearing of the resurrection of their last victim, be troubled with thick coming terrors, and see in mental view the souls of all they had murdered threatening vengeance on their guilty heads.

JOHN 11 : 23, 24. Jesus saith unto her, thy brother shall rise again. Martha saith unto him, I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the last day.

It is not needful to speak particularly of the circumstances which called forth this language. They ought to be familiar to every one ; and if any have not become acquainted with them, they can very easily, by turning to the place where they are recorded. The question to be considered is, did Martha have a simultaneous resurrection in view, which she believed would take place at the end of time, when she said, "I know that he shall rise again in the resurrection at the *last day* ?" We have not the slightest evidence that she did ; on the contrary, we have seen in a previous chapter, that in the Scriptures the phrase "*last day*" is equivalent in meaning, to the *Gospel day*, *the times of the Messiah*, *the reign of Christ in his kingdom*. The *last day* was understood, at the time Christ made his appearance on earth, to mean the same as the reign of the Messiah. And, doubtless, Martha's views of the Messianic kingdom were such as prevailed among her countrymen. These views were erroneous. According to them, Christ's reign

was to be temporal, the earth was to be cleansed and some part of it changed to a sort of Eden or Paradise, the dead were to be raised to life and once more dwell in it.

In commenting on John 6 : 31, Mr. Paige quotes the following from Lightfoot : " Many affirm that the hope of Israel is, that Messiah shall come and raise the dead, and they shall be gathered together in the garden of Eden, and shall eat and drink, and satiate themselves all the days of the world ; and that there are houses built of all precious stones, beds of silk, and rivers flowing with wine and spicy oil." Again, " They looked, as hath been already said, for the resurrection of the dead, at the coming of the Messiah." Take one instance : " R. Jeremiah said, when I die, bury me in my shirt, and with my shoes on, &c., that when Messiah comes, I may be ready dressed to meet him." Much more might be added to this testimony of Lightfoot, but this is sufficient to prove that the Jews believed that a resurrection would take place at the coming of the Messiah. This, without the least doubt, was Martha's opinion ; but did Christ sanction it ? If he did, he sanctioned a falsehood, for no such thing has yet occurred. If we carefully examine his conversation with Martha, we shall see that he did not countenance her views, but that, on the other hand, he corrected them in language well suited to the sad events which had brought him to Bethany. He did not dispute with her rudely, but mildly said, " Thy brother shall rise again." That is, he shall return again to mortal life. In this she understands

him to refer to the resurrection, which she believed would take place in the days of the Messiah. Jesus immediately goes on to correct this false sentiment, by saying, I am the resurrection and the life : he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and whosoever liveth and believeth in me, shall never die. **Believest thou this? The sense of which is this: Martha, call home your anxious and curious thoughts, and trust in me. You believe there will be a resurrection or renewal of life in the days of the Messiah; I am the Messiah; you desire that your brother may be immediately restored to life; but be content with this,—“I am the resurrection;” all that you are to expect of the resurrection or return to life, and the glory and happiness connected with it, is contained, completed, fulfilled in me. Understand me, I do not now speak of a return to being in some future time, but I mean that he who lives and believes in me shall never die. Already he has begun to live immortality by faith. The body only is subject to death; the soul does not die. It may, indeed, by sin and unbelief, be shrouded in the shadows of death, and feel the chilly influence of the pale king, but its essence is, in its very nature, immortal; and it contains in itself the elements of undecaying felicity. Do you feel and believe this as you ought, Martha? If so you ought not to be so anxious and sorrowful about your brother. Had you attended to my instructions on this subject as you ought, you would now be full of consolation and hope.**

“If this view of the subject be not correct, then

does Christ employ language strange and inexplicable. Martha tells him that she has not a doubt that her brother will rise at the last day ; and he, admitting and approving the sentiment, replies, ' I am the resurrection and the life,' intimating, on this construction, that what she said was very true, that at the last day *he* should raise her brother to an immortal life. He then proceeds, advancing in some way upon what he had just said, and informs her that all the dead shall live again, and that no living person shall die forever. But upon this view of the passage, what has he said but what Martha had already told him that she knew? For surely if she knew that Lazarus should rise again at the last day, she must, upon the same grounds, have known that all the dead would also arise at the last day, and that no living person would die forever. This view of the subject seems, in fact, to be precluded by the question which Christ immediately proposes, *Believest thou this? Can we suppose he would spend so many words to tell Martha what she already knew? and then, after all, ask her whether she believed this? "**

ACTS 2: 34. For David is not ascended into the heavens.

What did the apostle mean by this language? Did he intend to say that David had not been raised from the dead, and was consequently destitute of a conscious existence? Whatever he may have meant, it has been supposed that his language constitutes a strong proof of a simultaneous resurrection, and that

* Bush on the Resurrection, p. 247.

all others will remain, after they die, with David, in an unconscious or unraised state, till the great rising day, called the general resurrection. But to come to a right understanding of the apostle, we must for a moment glance at the context. We must remember that he uttered this passage on the day of Pentecost, when thousands were made to see that Christ was the true Messiah, and that the object of his mission was very different from what they had supposed.

Christ had been rejected and put to death as an impostor, because he did not answer the popular ideas of the Messiah. The general expectation was, that he would be a mighty conqueror, a wise sovereign, and a magnificent prince ; that he would deliver Israel from foreign oppression, extend his dominion over all the nations of the earth, and seat himself firmly on the ancient throne of David, from which would proceed, ever after, the laws that should govern the world; and as he did not meet this expectation, he was rejected in spite of all the wonders wrought by his hand.

On the day of Pentecost, Peter reasoned with the people, and out of the Scriptures proved that Christ was the true Messiah, though they had not received him as such. He pointed them to his resurrection, and showed from the Psalms that David had spoken of this very event. He says, "For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face ; for he is on my right hand that I should not be moved : therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad ; moreover, also, my flesh

shall rest in hope : because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine holy one to see corruption.”

Again : All the people considered that David had been a great king. Peter took advantage of this fact, and produced David's own testimony, that Christ would be a sovereign prince, vastly superior to himself. “Men and brethren,” said the apostle, “let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David that he is both dead and buried, and his sepulchre is with us unto this day. Therefore, being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne, he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither did his flesh see corruption. This Jesus hath God raised up, whereof we all are witnesses. Therefore, being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Ghost, he hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear.”

Here take particular notice of the expression, “*being by the right hand of God exalted.*” Does this not have direct reference to the words of the Psalmist,—“Sit thou at my right hand, till I have made thine enemies thy footstool? Ps. 110: 1. And does this not plainly imply that David expected that Christ would be exalted to a place of regal power in the Messianic kingdom, where he would reign till all his enemies should be made subject to his authority? Peter, in his first epistle, third chapter, and twenty-second

verse, confirms this idea by saying, "Christ, who is gone into heaven, and is on the *right hand* of God ; angels, and authorities, and powers, being made subject unto him." From this we learn that heaven was henceforth to be his throne, from which the affairs of his kingdom were to be administered, till all were brought into harmony with the principles of his government.

Again : Peter has language recorded in Acts 3: 19—21, which expresses the same idea, and which may, according to good authority, be paraphrased thus : "Repent, ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out ; so that the times of refreshing of the Gospel may come upon you from the presence of the Lord ; and he may send Jesus Christ in the preaching of the Gospel to you ; who will occupy the heavens, or the high places of mediatorial power, during the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." *

Thus has God "raised Christ from the dead and sat him at his own *right hand*, in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come ; and hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Ephesians 1 : 20 — 23. In view of this,

* Dr. Lightfoot.

Peter could say with propriety, that David had not yet ascended into the heavens, or had not been exalted to such a high place of authority and power, from which he would exercise the function of his government. David was a great king no doubt; but in view of the exaltation which Christ was to receive, he could without humility acknowledge himself vastly inferior.

CHAPTER X.

THE RESURRECTION OF CHRIST.

THERE has been a disposition among theologians to connect the resurrection of the material body with the immortality of man, as though the latter was in some way dependent upon the former ; and to such an extent has this idea prevailed that the resurrection of Christ's body is supposed to afford irrefragable evidence of the resurrection of the bodies of all men. Many of those who do not believe in the resurrection of the material body, admit that if Christ's body was really raised from the dead, it would necessarily follow that the bodies of all men will be raised ; and to avoid this conclusion they attempt to prove that the body of Christ was never raised. Professor Bush, in his late work on the resurrection, has a long chapter on the resurrection of Christ, in which he labors hard to show that he did not assume his material body when he left the tomb. But Christ says to his disciples, "Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself ; handle me and see ; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have." What stronger or plainer language than this could Christ have employed to give his disciples to understand, that the body which they saw and handled

was the very same that had been taken down from the cross and laid in the tomb? And were it not the same, did he not deceive them? Did he not tell them what was not true, when he gave them to understand that the body, which they then were examining, was the one which he wore when he was crucified? I can see no way of avoiding this conclusion; and if he deceived them in this particular, how do we know but that he has in many others?

Unless Christ's body was raised from the dead his prophecies in relation to his own resurrection were false. We read,—“Then answered the Jews, and said unto him, what sign shewest thou unto us, seeing that thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. Then said the Jews, forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou rear it up in three days? But he spake of the temple of his body.” John 2: 18, 19, 20, 21. This prediction of his resurrection is so clear and direct that it cannot be mistaken. *Destroy this temple*, he says—*meaning his body—and in three days I will raise it up*. The disciples understood by this language that he would raise up his material body; for “when therefore he was risen from the dead, his disciples remembered that he had said this unto them; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said.” John 2: 22. Here it is very obvious that if Christ's body was not raised, he was a false prophet.

It will be recollected that Thomas was very scept-

tical in relation to the resurrection of Christ. He said he would not believe unless he could examine the hands of his master, and put his finger into the print of the nails and thrust his hand into his side. Thomas, eight days after he had uttered this decisive language, had an interview with Jesus, who said to him, "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing. And Thomas answered and said unto him, My Lord, and my God. Jesus saith unto him, Thomas, because thou hast seen me, thou hast believed: blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed." St. John 20: 27, 28, 29. This was sufficient for Thomas; he believed. Hence Christ's body was raised from the dead, else he was most grossly deceived — miraculously deceived by his master.

Professor Bush very coolly admits that the disciples were deceived—that they believed in the bodily resurrection of Christ—an event which never occurred. If they were thus deceived, then was their faith based upon a stupendous falsehood, and so was the faith of all who followed their instruction. Notwithstanding all this, many of the Professor's Swedenborgian brethren devote much labor, and often whole sermons, to the work of showing that Christ's body was dispersed into its native elements before or at the time he left the tomb, and that consequently the body which his disciples saw, was not the body which was crucified, but a spiritual body — a body which was prepared for immortality and a pattern

of the bodies which men will receive at their resurrection. It is easy to understand why this ground is taken ; they do not believe in the resurrection of the material body ; and the impression seems to be general, that if Christ assumed, at his resurrection, the body which was nailed to the cross, it ascended with him to immortality, and is indubitable evidence that the bodies of all men will be raised to immortality also. But why any one should so think I know not. If we admit, that Christ exhibited to his disciples, after his resurrection, the same body in which he was crucified, it by no means follows that this body would go with him into the immortal world. It could be as easily dispersed into its primary elements at his ascension as at his resurrection ; and he could receive a spiritual body, as well at the former event as at the latter. And I know of no rational argument or passage of Scripture, which, if rightly interpreted, teaches that the body which Christ exhibited to his disciples, after he left the tomb, was a pattern of the bodies which all men shall receive at their resurrection from the dead. The divine testimony seems to point us rather to his appearance on the mount of Transfiguration, as a representation of what the resurrection bodies of all men will be. That the object of Christ's resurrection was not to prove that any human body would be raised from the dead is evident from many considerations. It seems almost impossible that any one could regard it as proof of such a doctrine. To whom could it be proof ? It could be no evidence to unbelieving

Jews and Gentiles of the resurrection of their bodies. They did not believe in his resurrection at all. They demanded the most conclusive evidence of the fact before they would believe any thing about it ; and when it was given them, what was there in the event that indicated that any other human body would ever be raised from the narrow house. Because the body of an individual had been roused from the sleep of death, whom God had clothed with wisdom and power, such as no man had previously possessed, could it reasonably be alleged that the body of any other man will be, who has never been distinguished among his fellows ? Who can be so unphilosophical and irrational, as to infer, because one body has been, by divine energy, restored to life on the morning of the third day after it had been deserted by the spirit, that all human bodies, after they have been dead thousands of years, will be raised to immortality ? Or, who so weak as to contend, because one body was re-occupied, after three days' desertion by the spirit, that all others must be, centuries after they have been mingled with the dust ? Why not infer, because Christ arose on the third day after his crucifixion, that the bodies of those who have died since have been raised in three days after their death ?

Why does the resurrection of Christ's body afford any more evidence of the resurrection of all human bodies, than does the resurrection of the body of the Shunamite's child by the power of God, operating through Elisha the prophet ? Certainly there is no

more analogy between the two cases, than there is between the resurrection of all bodies and the return to life of the dead body which touched the bones of the Prophet just mentioned, after they had been laid away to rest in the tomb?

But it was not the object or end of Christ's resurrection to prove that all or any human bodies would be raised to life after they had suffered death. What then was its object, or its objects? There were doubtless two things to be accomplished in the divine economy by the resurrection of Christ. The direct and immediate object was to prove the divinity of his mission, — the ultimate object a moral one.

The immediate purpose of Christ's resurrection was, to establish the divinity of his mission, — to show that God had commissioned and sent him to be a prophet, a teacher, a saviour,—to prove that he was the Christ whom God had promised to send into the world.

Jesus of Nazareth, though an obscure individual, whose native village was infamous in the eyes of most of his countrymen, and out of which they believed that no prophet could come, went forth claiming to be divinely appointed and sent, and miraculously endowed to promulgate to the world the doctrine of the immortality of man, or the resurrection of the dead, and to open and lead the way to eternal life. His countrymen were not willing to take his word for this; they, as might reasonably be supposed, demanded miraculous evidence. The consistency of this demand he did not deny; on the

contrary he asserted his divine authority by pointing to the works which he wrought. "The works which my Father hath given me to perform — the very works that I do — bear witness of me that the Father hath sent me." Nicodemus, the Pharisee, acknowledged these miraculous works as sufficient evidence of the divinity of his mission. "We know that thou art a teacher sent from God; for no man can do these miracles which thou doest, except God be with him." Peter offered the same proof of the same fact to the Jews. He says, "Jesus of Nazareth, (proved to you to be a man from God,) by miracles and wonders and signs which God did by him in the midst of you." Thus did Christ and his followers contend, and thus did the more consistent and liberal of his countrymen grant, that miraculous evidence was sufficient to prove that he bore the seals of divine authority—that he was commissioned and sent by God to instruct man in the ways of truth and duty.

But Jesus was finally crucified, and the miracles which God wrought by him could no longer be pointed to as evidence of the divinity of his mission; therefore the disciples constantly and fearlessly presented in proof of it, a miracle which God wrought upon him, in raising him bodily from the dead. This resurrection was an undoubted and wonderful exhibition of Omnipotent energy. It was a clear and positive interposition of the original Giver of life; and the apostles, in their defence of Christianity, and in their preaching, generally pointed to it as proof

that the Almighty had assisted and approved him in all his works and teachings. This one fact soon occupied a more prominent place in their minds than all others ; for it was a most undeniable sanction of God to all their Master had done, or taught, or claimed, and consequently proof positive of the immortality of all men. Jesus predicted that he should be raised upon the third day ; and when this was accomplished, he was proved to be a true prophet. The spirit of prophecy is a miraculous gift ; and he who possesses it is proved to be divinely commissioned. Prove the resurrection of Christ false, and you disprove the divinity of his mission, make him an impostor, and destroy the credibility of the evangelists ; for they all testified most unequivocally to it ; and if their testimony was false in this, no confidence can be put in any thing else they have written ; and the conclusion is, that men were left to account as best they could for the existence and prevalence of Christianity in the world ; and if they believed it, their faith must rest upon nothing better than base imposition. That Christ's body was raised from the tomb, after he had predicted his resurrection, and after he had been crucified, seems sufficient to satisfy every one who believed in that astounding fact, that he was from God, and that whatever he taught was dictated by the spirit of God. That fact must have carried conviction to the minds of those who disregarded his miracles. The envious and the doubting might have ascribed the miracles to legerdemain or magic, or to the prince of demons.

But neither of these could open the tomb, and rescue an individual from the cold embrace of death, and bring him forth to the light of life, and enable him to stand before men, as though the grave had never closed upon him. The evidences of the divinity of his mission, which were continually accumulating as he advanced in his career of beneficence and miraculous operations, proving that God was with him, gathered in a bright halo around the tomb. The glory and truth of heaven, by which his whole course had been made radiant, was drawn to a focus upon that; and as he burst its confines, raising to the heavens his nail-pierced hands, it was impossible for those who saw him rise,—and it is impossible for those who heartily believe that he rose, not to believe with the apostle Paul that he “was raised from the dead by the Omnipotence of the Father.”

This the apostles realized; and therefore this is the reason, when they took their lives in their hands and went out to scatter the seeds of truth and righteousness over the face of the Gentile world, that they attached so much importance to the resurrection of Christ from the dead. This they considered the foundation upon which the whole temple of eternal life must be reared. Faith in that one fact lay at the bottom of the Gospel system. To prove that, was to prove all they had been instructed to preach. Upon that fact, they were willing to stake all they held dear. “If Christ be not risen,” says Paul, “then is our preaching vain, and your faith is

also vain ; yea, and we are found false witnesses of God, because we have testified of God that he hath raised up Christ." Thus does the apostle risk his whole cause, his reputation for honesty, and his temporal and spiritual welfare, upon the single fact that the Son of man was raised from the dead. He does this because that was a fact ; and because on the belief of it must be based the belief in the divinity of Christ's mission, in every mind to which his gospel should be addressed. Now the divinity of his mission being established, all he taught or revealed is established according to his claims ; for none can be so void of reason as to suppose that the God of the universe would either send forth a messenger to publish falsehood, and bestow upon him miraculous powers to witness to it ; or that a divinely commissioned herald of truth would prove recreant, and proclaim a falsehood to the children of men.

It being a fact, then, that the apostles constantly pointed to the resurrection of Christ as a pre-eminent proof of the divinity of his mission ; and that it must be, by all minds, in all ages, considered as irrefragable evidence of it,—the conclusion is legitimate that the direct and immediate object of that wonderful event was, to give evidence of that great truth, upon which the whole Christian system is based.

The resurrection of Christ has another work to perform beside that of operating upon the intellect, or convincing the understanding, and that is upon the heart. Its ultimate object is a moral one. Saith

an apostle, "He was delivered for our offences, and *raised for our justification*"—that "God raised up Jesus from the dead, and gave him glory, that our hope as well as our faith might be in God"—and that as Christ was raised from the dead by the power of the Father so we should walk in newness of life." Says Paul, "If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." Thus we must *rise with him* above all the works of death, *through faith* in the power of God who raised him from the dead.

"The revival of Christ, to be sure, is a bare physical fact. A certain portion of organized matter passed out of one state into another state. Yet when should we come to an end of enumerating the influences of that fact? It is the key-stone to Jewish history. It binds together into a whole the extraordinary narrative which begins with the call of Abraham, or the mission of Moses, and ends in the destruction of the Jewish polity and the dispersion of the Jews. To both events, and all that intervenes, it gives meaning and unity. That bare physical fact illustrates the character of the pure and infinite Spirit. It reveals God as the Almighty and the all-loving. Look at it in its effects on the speculations of philosophers; it solved the most difficult question in which they had entangled themselves, and the most deeply interesting. It superseded their conflicting arguments on the destiny of man, and made historical fact banish metaphysical doubt. See its political bearing: how large a portion it has col-

ored of the broad surface of the stream of time. On theory and practice, mind and manners, private life and public history, the past and the future,—how illimitable are its influences!”*

* W. J. Fox.

CHAPTER XI.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE FIFTEENTH CHAPTER OF FIRST CORINTHIANS.

By consulting chapter 3: 6—10, of this epistle to the Corinthians, and Acts 18: 1—18, we learn that St. Paul was the first who preached the gospel at Corinth, that city of splendor and moral corruption. He labored there a considerable length of time, and succeeded in establishing a church, composed, probably, of Jews and Gentiles. But having work to do in other places, he was obliged to leave them, after which other teachers visited Corinth, and were the cause of much strife and improper conduct among the brethren, who gradually fell from their first estate, and finally became extremely disorderly and licentious. (chap. 1: 11, 12; 3: 3—10, 22.) This was probably brought about in part by their teachers, and in part by old habits and the vicious practices of those around them. Paul hearing of this wrote to them (chap. 5: 9) an epistle, which is not now extant. But it seems they paid little or no attention to his rebukes and instructions. At all events, they did not improve by his admonitions; and some of their teachers denied his authority altogether, and taught doctrines which were false in

theory and pernicious in practice. (chap. 6 : 18, 19; 9 : 1 — 3 ; 14 : 37.) So that they were not only vile in their general deportment, but they had embraced certain errors in doctrine, which induced some to deny the resurrection of the dead.

Thus had things come to such a crisis, that some of the church wrote a letter to St. Paul, asking for instruction in relation to certain particulars. When he received this letter, and learned from the bearers of it, more fully, the debased condition of the church at Corinth, he wrote this epistle, which is called the first to the Corinthians. And in the fifteenth chapter he gives the doctrine of the resurrection a thorough examination ; a far more extended and elaborate consideration than any other of the New Testament writers. In fact, the doctrine is no where else so luminously and extensively considered in the Bible.

He commences by stating that his views of the Gospel were the same that they were when he was with them, laboring to build them up in the most holy faith ; and by which, if they had not forgotten his teachings, and believed in vain, they were saved, that is, brought into harmony with the requirements of the divine government, or into reconciliation to God. But from all these circumstances, it was evident that little of this work had been done, especially upon those who denied the doctrine of the resurrection ; and hence, he goes on to give them a clear view of the foundation upon which that doctrine rests. He says, that among the first things

which he had preached unto them, was that Christ died as a sin-offering, was buried, and rose again the third day from the dead, according to the Scriptures. (verses 3, 4, 5.) This was not a matter of dispute, for after his resurrection (verses 6, 7, 8,) he was seen by Cephas, or Simon Peter, then by all the apostles, or by the twelve. After that, more than five hundred brethren saw him at one time ; some of whom had died, but a large number of them were still living. Again, he was seen by James, then by all the apostles; and last of all he appeared to Paul himself, while he was journeying to Damascus with authority from the chief priests to persecute the church of God. (verses 9, 10.)

Here (verses 9, 10,) the apostle deviates a little from his main subject, to dwell a few moments on the humiliating thought of his former blindness and bigotry, which pressed heavily on his mind. He says, he was not worthy to be called an apostle ; but that the grace of God had made him one ; and that that grace was not bestowed in vain ; for it had made him labor more efficiently in the Gospel vineyard than all the apostles.

But he now returns (verse 11) to the main subject, by saying that he agreed with all the apostles in preaching that Christ was actually raised from the dead ; and that this was believed, also, by those whom he addressed. Not doubting this fact, he shows them (verses 12 — 16) that their unbelief, in relation to the resurrection of all men from the dead, was absurd ; for he contended, that if they admitted

the resurrection of Christ, then they admitted that one dead person had been raised to life, and if one had been raised, then there was no reason to doubt the ability and will of God to raise up all the dead. But, if it were true, as some affirmed, that the dead could not be raised, then Christ was not raised ; and if Christ was not raised, they who had preached and they who had believed the doctrine of his resurrection, had preached and believed a base delusion ; yea, more, the preachers of that delusion had^d lied concerning God, by testifying that he had raised up Christ whom he had not raised up.

Here (verse 17) the apostle halts a little, to draw the conclusions which naturally followed the position that Christ was not risen. In the first place, he concluded that the Christian system was a sheer delusion, and that those who had embraced it were grossly deceived, and were trusting in a stupendous falsehood, instead of cherishing that truth of God which is able to save the soul from sin. In the second place, (verse 18) those who had fallen asleep in Christ, or died believing in him, were perished or annihilated. There could be no evidence to the contrary, if Christ was not raised ; for to Christians there is no other infallible ground of hope, however much speculation there may be in the world about the future life, growing out of the desires of men, and the inferences which they are able to draw from some of the dispensations of the Divine Providence. Moreover, if there was nothing to hope from Christ beyond this life, those who had trusted in him were

of all men the most to be pitied ; for this trust had brought upon them the most bitter persecution, and in consequence of their faith they had been exposed to all sorts of danger.

But the apostle (verse 20) re-asserts the truth of Christ's resurrection. Now is Christ risen from the dead, says he, (verses 20 — 23,) and become the certain pledge, the highest evidence that all the dead shall be raised to immortal life. For, since man brought death with him into the world, it was highly proper for him to bring deliverance from it. Adam introduced the bondage of death ; Christ the emancipation from it. Adam was created mortal ; the seeds of decay and death were planted by the Creator in his system ; consequently he died, and as all his desendants have a similar constitution, they are destined to die also ; and as all Adam's posterity have, and must follow him to the regions of the dead ; so all shall follow Christ to the realms of eternal life, " or be raised to immortality in that constitution of which he is the head, and which his resurrection first demonstrated." This does not, to be sure, assert in so many words that the dead shall be raised simultaneously with their dying, but it does imply that they shall be raised successively. Adam died first, and all up to this time have followed him in quick succession ; so shall they be made alive in Christ successively. All having Adam's mortal constitution die, or follow him one after another to the grave, but all that follow him there shall be made alive in Christ. How? not simultaneously, but

successively as they have died in Adam. "But every man in his own order, Christ the first fruits; afterwards, they that are Christ's at his coming." (verse 23.) Here are difficulties, and the question presents itself, What are we to understand by the "order," the "first fruits," and the coming which the apostle mentions? We know how this is generally answered, but where is the evidence that the apostle had reference to order of time, when he said, "every man in his own order?" There is nothing in the Scriptures, to my knowledge, that affords such evidence. The apostle himself intimates nothing of the kind. But his whole train of remarks, as we have followed him up to this point, indicates plainly that he had reference to *evidence*, and not to *time*, when he used the phrase, "every man in his own order." This will be more apparent if we examine the other parts of the verse.

If we are to understand the phrase, "every man in his own order," as referring to time, we must understand the apostle to say, that Christ was the first in order of time that had arisen from the dead. But this would not be true. If we may believe the Scriptures, we know that a number of persons had been raised from the dead previous to Christ's resurrection. The Shunamite's son, Jairus' daughter, the young man at Nain, and Lazarus, had been raised to life before Christ's crucifixion. It may be said that he was the first that arose to immortality, to die no more. But this is not true; Moses and Elias had been raised from the dead to immortality, and enjoyed a con-

scious existence, or they could not have conversed with Christ as they did on the mount of Transfiguration, in the presence of his disciples, who understood that they appeared personally in their glorious resurrection bodies. We read in Matt. 22 : 31, 32, "But as touching the resurrection of the dead, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, saying, I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead, but of the living." To this, Luke adds, "For all live unto him." Here it is plainly stated that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living, yet he is the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, who had been dead many long ages. Of course they must have been living in the immortal world, when Christ used this language, else God was God of the dead. But how could they be living unless they had been raised from the dead? Christ was not the first, then, in order of time, that was revived from the dead, or that arose to immortality to die no more.

But there is no need of making the Bible contradict itself in this manner. The phrases "first born," "first fruits," etc., do not necessarily mean first in order of time, but according to scripture usage they mean pledge or pre-eminence. Of the phrase first born, says Dr. Clarke, "From its use in a great variety of places, in the Scriptures, it is evident that it means the *chief, most excellent, best beloved, most distinguished, &c.*" Agreeable to this, St. Paul says of Jesus, in Colossians 1 : 18, "And he is the

head of the body, the church, who is the beginning, (the chief,) the first born from the dead, that in all things he might have the *pre-eminence*. In Romans 8 : 29, Christ is called the "first born among many brethren ; that is, he is more *excellent* than all creatures, and greater than all the children of men." In Hebrews 12 : 23, we read of "the general assembly and church of the first born, that is the most noble and excellent of all human, if not created beings." The following passage may be urged as an objection to this view of the subject : "That Christ should suffer, and that he should be the first that should rise from the dead." This does seem to be very decisive in making Christ the first that arose from the dead ; but according to Wakefield's translation, the whole passage should read thus : "That Christ would suffer death, and would be the *first* to proclaim salvation to this people and the Gentiles, *by a resurrection from the dead.*" The word (*protos*,) which is here rendered *first*, according to Donnegan, means first in place, rank, or eminence ; the most eminent, the most illustrious, the principal. Even this passage, then, affords no evidence that Christ was the first which arose from the dead ; it only makes him the most eminent among those that had been raised.

Take now the phrase, "first fruits," and according to the ordinances of Moses, it signifies that portion of the crop which was selected and presented in the sanctuary, before the main harvest was gathered in. But these first fruits were offered, not to prove that

they were the first that had ripened, but as the pledge and assurance of the consecration of the whole harvest, throughout the whole nation, to God. So Christ stood pre-eminent among those that had been raised from the dead. Others had been raised to mortal life only to die again ; but he had been raised, to die no more, to immortality, and thus had he become the sure pledge, the highest evidence of the resurrection of all men to immortality.

But afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. This seems to indicate that there might be some at his coming, who would not be acknowledged as belonging to Christ ; and if the coming refers to a general resurrection, then such would not be raised. To avoid this conclusion it has been maintained that all men are Christ's ; they being related to him as the general harvest to the first fruits ; " Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's " — are his to make alive, as mentioned in the preceding verse. This seems rather far-fetched. On examination, a number of passages have been found in the New Testament, which speak of some who were Christ's, but they were such as professed to believe in him, and had been more or less faithful in his cause and in the practice of his precepts. We read Galatians 5 : 24, " And they that were Christ's have crucified the flesh with affections and lusts." " Now if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of his." Romans 8 : 9. None are Christ's, then, but those who have his spirit ; and if none but such are to be raised from the dead, few will be raised. For I suppose it will

not be denied that some die without having the spirit of Christ, in the sense here mentioned ; and if they are not raised from the dead, till they do receive it, they will never be raised, unless there is an intermediate state between death and the resurrection where they can enjoy Gospel privileges. But this is a doctrine believed by so few, and so unscriptural and unreasonable, that it would be time misemployed to examine it.

The phrase "they that are Christ's" must mean, then, his faithful disciples ; and the phrase "at his coming" must have reference to his coming in his kingdom ; for no other coming of Christ is mentioned in the New Testament. We are not told there that he will come at some time, yet future, to raise at once all the dead to immortality. So that we may understand that those of Christ's disciples who had laid down their lives in his cause, would stand before the world as witnesses, at the commencement and during his mediatorial reign, of his resurrection and consequently of the resurrection of all men. When Christ was crucified, his disciples all forsook him and fled, for fear of the Jews, but when he arose from the dead a change came over them ; so impressed were they with the importance of the fact of his resurrection that they went forth in the face of all opposition, and preached Jesus and the resurrection, showing that on his resurrection hinged the door which opened into regions of immortality reserved for all mankind, and finally by laying down their lives as a testimony of their sincerity, they have stood as witnesses of that

doctrine even unto this day. The Revelator John confirms this idea. He says, "And I saw thrones, and they sat upon them, and judgment was given unto them: and I saw the souls of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus, and for the word of God, and which had not worshipped the beast, neither his image, neither had received the mark upon their foreheads or in their hands; and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years." Rev. 20: 4. And how does it revive our drooping faith to realize that there were men who declared, in the most solemn manner, that they were well acquainted with Jesus of Nazareth, before he was crucified, and that they saw him after the resurrection, and knew him to be the same individual who had been put to death, and finally sealed their testimony with their blood! If they testified falsely they persisted in it unto death; and thus preferred to suffer death rather than to abandon what they knew to be false. We have often heard of men who have died martyrs to what they supposed to be true; but it is incredible that men should knowingly assert a falsehood, and then yield up their lives and all earthly interests in the support of it.

The apostle, having spoken in the previous verse (23) of Christ's coming, proceeds to enlarge on his mediatorial reign. He says, "Then cometh the end;" and some contend that this *end* and the *coming* mentioned in the twenty-third verse are simultaneous events. The apostle's language, however, indicates nothing of the kind; it rather appears to have been selected so as to guard against the idea. To support

it, his language should read thus : but every man in his own order ; Christ the first fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming, at the general resurrection, for the end cometh when the general resurrection shall take place. But, on the contrary, he says, " Every man in his own order, Christ the first-fruits, afterwards they that are Christ's at his coming. The end shall be, then, when he shall have delivered up the kingdom to God, even the Father ; when he shall have put down all rule and all authority and power. For he must (come) and reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet; the last enemy death shall be destroyed." From this it appears that the end and the coming are two distinct events, between which a great work must be accomplished. The *coming* refers to Christ's coming in his kingdom ; hence the end will not be till he has reigned in it long enough to abolish all opposing power and authority, and to lay at his feet all principles and conditions, adverse to the principles and conditions of his government ; and as immortal life belonged to the economy over which he had been placed, he will continue in the work committed to his hands till death, the last enemy, is destroyed; for to this end, and to the end that he might subject to his authority all intelligences, God, in the divine counsels, before the world was, put all things under his feet. But when it is said that all things were put under him, it is manifest that God is excepted—that he did not put himself under Christ ; for he is to reign, till he subdues every thing inimical to the principles of his kingdom only ; then he will deliver up the kingdom to

God, and become subject himself to him of whom he received his authority; and thus God will be all in all.

The apostle is too explicit here, to be misunderstood. He places the mediatorial reign of Christ in such a light as to leave no grounds for disputing the final reconciliation and consequent happiness of all men. The attempts which have been made to put another construction upon it — to sustain the trinity and vicarious atonement, are puerile and unworthy of the least consideration.

But having settled the point with regard to the rise, progress, and consummation of Christ's kingdom or reign, the apostle reverts back to the nineteenth verse, and pursues farther the train of remark he had introduced, concerning the absurdity involved in the denial of the resurrection of the dead.

“ Else what shall they do, which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all? why are they baptized for the dead? And why stand we in jeopardy every hour?” (verses 29, 30.) Here is a question extremely embarrassing to expositors, and has received as great a variety of explanations as any other portion of Scripture. “ Else what shall they do, which are baptized for the dead, if the dead rise not at all?” What is the import of this question? Among the expositions given of it the following appears the most plausible: ‘There was a custom among some of the churches, as early as the commencement of the third century at least, of baptizing persons for, or in behalf of such converts as died without baptism. In all probability this practice prevailed in the church at Corinth,

at the time this epistle was written ; and therefore the apostle took occasion to show that it was very inconsistent to regard such a ceremony, and at the same time deny the resurrection of the dead. This construction seems more evident from the fact that the Greek article is used thus — baptized for *the* dead — while it is not often employed in those places where all the dead are mentioned or designated, which indicates that the apostle designed to point out a particular class of the dead, for whom others were baptized, rather than the dead universally.* The question which he asks immediately following this one, is not so difficult of solution : “ Why stand we in jeopardy every hour ? ” or rather what inducement have we to hazard our lives and earthly interests in promulgating the Gospel, if there be no resurrection of the dead ? Yêt saith the apostle, to the Corinthians, (verses 31, 32, 33, 34,) if I have been instrumental in bringing you to a knowledge of Christ, I rejoice, though I die daily,” or am continually in danger of losing my life. I consider the danger and hardship to which I am exposed but a small matter, if the doctrine of the resurrection be true ; but if it be not true, why should I expose myself thus ? What advantage will accrue to me for having contended with a fierce and beastly mob at Ephesus, (verse 32) if my hope in the resurrection be a delusion ? What motive is there to induce one to brave all the dangers of martyrdom if the dead rise not ? Than to do this, we had better eat

* See the Notes of H. Ballou, 2d., on this chapter, *Uni-Quarterly*, vol 2, No. 11, p. 161.

and drink, and gratify our animal propensities, as the highest good within our reach ; for we shall soon die, and then the means of every kind of enjoyment will be forever beyond our reach. But, brethren, be not deceived by the false and pernicious sentiments and habits, which are so prevalent around you. " Evil communications corrupt good manners ;" and your daily contact with the sensual disciples of Epicurus, who flood Corinth with their licentiousness, is dangerous. Therefore it is time for you to abandon your sins, and awake to righteousness, and thus guard yourselves against the corrupting influences to which you are exposed.

Here the apostle anticipates that a difficulty might arise in some minds concerning the resurrection. He supposes, (see verses 35, 36, 37, 38,) that some might ask, " How are the dead raised up ? and with what body do they come.?" A foolish question, answers he, involving no difficulty of an inseparable nature. "Thou sowest not that body that shall be, but bare grain," &c. A kernel of wheat must fall into the ground and die, or it will remain unproductive. But the kernel which springs from the one sown is not the same that was sown ; it is different, though similar in appearance, whether it be wheat or any other grain.* We are not to understand, of course, that

*The inquiry what makes vegetables the same, in the common acceptation of the word, does not appear to have any relation to this of personal identity ; because the word *same*, when applied to them and to persons, is not only applied to different subjects, but it is also used in different senses. For when a man swears to the same tree, as having stood fifty years in the same place, he means only the same as to all the purposes of

he kernel of grain dies totally ; this would make the apostle utter a philosophical absurdity ; but we are to understand that only the farinaceous parts die ; the germ which they enfold does not die ; it springs up and receives another body — not the same, though similar to the one sown. In like manner, the human body dies, but the spirit springs forth unhurt by death, and receives a new body from the hand of God, fitted to the new circumstances of its existence. For “God giveth it a body as it hath pleased him, and to every seed its own body ;” that is, its own proper body. He does not give a germ of wheat, a body of barley. He has so arranged the laws of the natural world

property and uses of common life, and not that the tree has been all that time the same in the strict philosophical sense of the word. For he does not know whether any one particle of the present tree be the same with any one particle of the tree which stood in the same place fifty years ago. And if they have not one common particle of matter, they cannot be the same tree, in the proper philosophical sense of the word *same*; it being evidently a contradiction in terms to say they are, when no part of their substance, and no one of their properties, is the same — no part of their substance, by the supposition ; and no one of their properties, because it is allowed that the same property cannot be transferred from one substance to another. And therefore when we say the identity or sameness of a plant consists in a continuation of the same life communicated under the same organization, to a number of particles of matter, whether the same or not, the word *same*, when applied to life and organization, cannot possibly be understood to signify what it signifies in this very sentence when applied to matter. In a loose and popular sense, then, the life, and the organization, and the plant are justly said to be the same, notwithstanding the perpetual change of the parts. But in a strict and philosophical manner of speech, no man, no being, no mode of being, nor any thing, can be the same with that with which it hath indeed nothing the same. Now sameness is used in this latter sense applied to persons. The identity of these, therefore, cannot subsist with diversity of substance.” [Butler’s Anal. Dissert. I.

that when grain is sown, whatever may be the kind, it will receive its own proper body ; and though it will not be the same that was sown — yet it will be similar to it. A barley germ will receive a barley body ; a wheat germ will receive a wheat body, and not the converse. So the human body dies and God provides the spirit with a spiritual body, — not formed like a beast, or bird, or fish — similar in appearance, though different in quality from the natural one, which has been consigned to death. Hence individuals will have no difficulty in identifying each other. This conception (verses 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45,) involves no difficulty ; for we know that there are various kinds of bodies. There are terrestrial and celestial bodies, all differing from each other in glory. There are different kinds of flesh, — flesh of men, of beasts, of birds, and of fishes. So will our resurrection bodies differ from our mortal bodies. The one is corruptible and must die, the other is incorruptible and not subject to death. The one is dishonorable, the other will be glorious. The one is weak, the other will be powerful. The one is an animal body, the other a spiritual body. And so it is written in Genesis 2: 7, that the “Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life and man became a living soul,” or a living, animate being. “Such is the constitution we all inherit from the first man Adam.” “The last Adam is made a quickening spirit,” That is, Christ, who is the representation of all men in the resurrection state, and in whom they are all to be made alive,

is a spirit that vivifies, makes alive, and such is to be our constitution hereafter."

But all men receive the animal constitution or body first; the spiritual afterward. (verses 46, 47, 48, 49.) As the first state of man is in the same kind of constitution that Adam had, that is, of the earth, earthy; so, the second state of man is to be in the constitution of the Lord Jesus Christ, that is, from heaven, heavenly. For "As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy; and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly."

But saith the apostle, in order that this may come to pass, the body with its appetites and passions must be wholly laid aside. "It cannot inherit the kingdom of God. It was of the dust and must return to, and mingle with the dust, as it was before formed into human bodies."

The apostle having thus concluded, (in verse 50,) from his previous arguments, that "flesh and blood" could not inherit or go into the kingdom of God, proceeds to remove a difficulty that this conclusion might suggest to the minds of the Corinthians. "Behold I show you a mystery," says he, or rather I will lay open plainly, or explain a matter, which seems to you mysterious. He had spoken of the resurrection state as being glorious beyond all conception; he had labored to show that nothing earthly could equal it; and he had affirmed that if the doctrine of Christ concerning it were true, he regarded the evils he had suf-

ferred in its promulgation not worthy of mention, and that with it in view he could wade through seas of affliction rejoicing. And yet he contended that flesh and blood could not enter upon that state. Well might such sentiments appear mysterious to those who had never enjoyed much happiness, higher than that which arises from sensual gratification; and such doubtless were many of the Corinthians. At least, sensual pleasure must have held a high place in their world of felicity. Look at the condition of Corinth when St. Paul first visited it; view it as described by the writers of Greece and Rome. It was a place wholly given to luxury and sensualism. It was noted for its great wealth, gross licentiousness, and extensive trade. It was filled with the most splendid and magnificent specimens of Grecian art. It abounded in what Gibbon has called, "the cheerful devotion, the elegant forms, and agreeable fictions of Grecian superstition." In its vicinity was the god Neptune honored by celebrations and games, and hard by was the temple of Venus, that splendid den of moral pollution. The whole city was filled with libraries, schools, and sophists; and the people were fed continually upon a corrupt and enervating literature. In short it was overrun by the disciples of Epicurus, who denied the immortality of the soul and placed the sum of human happiness in corporeal pleasure. In such a city and from among such a people was the church at Corinth gathered. Is it to be supposed, that the members of this church could at once divest themselves of all the habits, feelings, and sentiments

in which they had been educated? No; the epistles which the apostle wrote to them, show that in spite of all the instruction he had given them while with them personally, they were strongly attached to their old habits and sentiments. It is not at all strange, then, that the doctrine of the resurrection, as presented by the apostle, should appear mysterious. How could they appreciate the blessedness of a heaven, where flesh and blood could not enter, and which would yield spiritual happiness only. Their spiritual nature had been cultivated but little, and of course they had known comparatively nothing of spiritual enjoyment. When, therefore, they heard the apostle speak with so much enthusiasm of a resurrection state, where only spiritual pleasure was to be found, and where "flesh and blood" could never enter, it is no marvel, that they should regard the matter as some what mystical. But he proceeds to explain it by saying, (verses 51—55,) "we shall not all sleep, but we shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump. (For the trump shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and we shall be changed.) For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality."

The words, *To phtharton*, rendered corruptible, and *To thueton*, mortal, should be construed as adjectives in the neuter gender, signifying persons. This will not be thought improper, when it is remembered that the apostle, in the forty-sixth verse, uses two adjectives in the neuter gender to signify the persons of Adam and Christ, in a manner precluding the pos-

sibility of understanding them in any other sense. He says, "And so it is written, the first man Adam was made a living soul, the last Adam was made a quickening spirit. Howbeit that was not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; and afterward that which is spiritual." So, in Matthew 1 : 20, and Luke 1 : 35, we find adjectives of the neuter gender used to signify the person of Christ. The apostle, therefore, must not be understood as saying that these mortal and corruptible bodies will put on immortality and incorruption, but that the persons who have worn mortal and corruptible bodies here will be clothed upon with incorruptible and immortal bodies, in the resurrection state; or that this mortal man shall put on immortality, and this corruptible man shall put on incorruption.

But from the different theories which this language has been made to support, it would seem that the apostle's explanation needs to be explained. It has been supposed by some, that he was mistaken in relation to the nature of and the time when the change, he mentions, would take place. It is said "that the general expectation of the Jews looked forward to a period of consummation or restitution, frequently called the "last day" — "the world to come" — "the reign of the Messiah," — when a new order of things was to be ushered in, among which was to be the event denominated the *resurrection* of the dead. And it is thought that the apostle expected this event would take place at the time of Christ's coming, at the destruction of the Jewish polity and the city of Jeru-

saalem, and the setting up his own kingdom ; and that, therefore, when he said, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," he meant, that some of those who were then professed Christians would live till Christ come, and that then the dead would be raised, and the living changed to immortality without tasting death. If the apostle really made such a mistake as this, can we place full confidence in any of his teachings? If he could be mistaken in a matter, so important as this, how do we know, but he makes mistakes when he pretends to explain some of the most important parts of the Christian religion? In fact, if we begin to doubt his statements, where shall we stop? It seems to me that every effort, made to convict the apostle of mistakes in his statements, is directly calculated to bring distrust upon every thing he has written. Besides, there is nothing in all his teachings, which goes to show that he misunderstood the nature of Christ's coming, and of his kingdom. And we shall dismiss this part of the subject by simply saying, that we have full confidence in the apostle, as an able and intelligent expounder of the Christian system, who was too conscientious to preach, for truth, doctrines which he did not understand.

But there are others, who think he recognizes and supports their notions of a simultaneous resurrection, yet future. They maintain, that when he said, "we shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," he meant that when the general resurrection shall take place, there will be some living on the earth, and that such will not die, but will be changed in a moment,

from mortality to immortality. But let it be remarked here, that if this be true, the apostle makes a very uncommon, if not an improper use of the pronoun *we*. He says, "*We* shall not all sleep, (die) but *we* shall all be changed." Did he mean by this, that he, and some of those whom he addressed, would remain alive on the earth till the general resurrection, which is yet future, and then be changed to immortality? If sō, he must have been grossly mistaken; and if not so, what did he mean? Would it not be well to prove "the general resurrection" to be a Bible doctrine, before we undertake to make the apostle's language apply to it? — forcing it into such an awkward position. I am acquainted with no Scripture, that, when rightly interpreted, will yield the least evidence of a general or simultaneous resurrection. I can see nothing in the divine economy demanding such a resurrection, and I know of no reason in the wide world for it. Certainly, till this doctrine can be proved from some other source, the apostle's language ought not to be pressed into its service; for this would be wresting it from its natural import; and it can be explained much more consistently in another way.

When we look at his previous remarks, the import of his language under consideration is very obvious. He had stated that the first or earthly state of man is in the animal constitution of Adam, the earthy; and that the second state would be in the spiritual constitution of Christ, the Lord from heaven. In order to this last state, every individual must, of course, undergo a great change. "Hence," saith the apostle,

“we shall not all sleep,” in death ; that is, the whole or every part of us will not die, but every part of us will be changed. The body will die and be changed to dust ; the spirit will not die, but will be changed from a natural to a spiritual body. “For this corruptible must put on incorruption, and this mortal must put on immortality.”

That this was the change contemplated by the apostle, is evident from the tenor of his remarks, found in close connection with the language under examination, as follows : “Now, this I say, brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God ; neither doth corruption inherit incorruption. Behold, I show you a mystery : we shall not all sleep, but shall all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump.” Here the apostle encloses an explanation in a parenthesis, (“For the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible, and *we* shall be changed.”) Let it be carefully noticed, in this place, that only the *we* is spoken of, as being subject to a change ; hence, we conclude, from what the apostle says in other parts of the chapter about the change, which all who have borne the image of Adam must undergo, that the *dead*, who should be raised, and the *we*, who should be changed, mean the same individuals. If all men do not die, what sense is there in his reasoning ? For he says, “Thou fool ! that which thou sowest is not quickened except it first die.” If there ever shall be any who do not die, they will not be quickened or raised from the dead, and if they are ever favored

with a view of the immortal world, they must be ushered into it bodily, with all the infirmities of the flesh clinging to them, and the saying that "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," will be proved untrue. Farther, I apprehend that the change from mortality to immortality, cannot be effected without the agency of death,—that none can experience this transition without dying. This will be manifest if we consider that death, according to the apostle's analogical argument, drawn from the kernel of wheat, is merely the dissolution of the body, of the material organization, the means by which the spirit keeps up its communication with the present world, and the departure of the spirit into a spiritual body prepared for it.

But it may be asked whether this idea of death comports with the apostle's doctrine of the resurrection? We answer, yes; for we think it susceptible of strong proof that St. Paul, and all of the other New Testament writers, in most cases, used the word *Anastasis*, translated resurrection, as signifying *future life* — not the *process* by which individuals are brought to the future life; not the means of transition from the present to the future life; but the future life itself. Dr. Dwight, in his sermon on the resurrection, after observing that the subject treated by Paul, I. Cor. 15, is the *Anastasis*, or future *existence* of man, thus proceeds: "This word *Anastasis* is commonly, but often erroneously, rendered *resurrection*. So far as I have observed, it usually denotes our *existence beyond the grave*. Its original and lit-

eral meaning is, *to stand up*, or *stand again*. As standing is the appropriate posture of *life, consciousness* and *activity*, and lying down the appropriate posture of the *dead*, the *unconscious* and the *inactive*, this word is not unnaturally employed to denote the future state of spirits, who are living, conscious, and active beings. Many passages of Scripture would have been rendered more intelligible, and the thoughts contained in them more just and impressive, had this word been translated agreeable to its real meaning. This observation will be sufficiently illustrated by a recurrence to that remarkable passage which contains the dispute between our Saviour and the Sadducees. "Then came unto him," says the evangelist, "the Sadducees, who say there is no resurrection, (*me einai anastasin*,) that there is no *future state*, or no future existence of mankind. They declare seven brothers to have married successively one wife, who survived them all. They then ask, "whose wife shall she be *in the resurrection*," (*en te anastesei*,) in the *future state*? Our Saviour answers, "In the resurrection," or as it should be rendered, "In the *future state*, they neither marry nor are given in marriage, but are as the angels of God in heaven. But as touching the *resurrection of the dead*, have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God?"—or, as it ought to be rendered, "Have ye not read that which was spoken unto you by God, concerning the *future existence of those who are dead*, saying, I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob? God is not the God of the dead but of the living."

This passage, (continues Dr. Dwight) were we at any loss concerning the meaning of the word *anastasis*, determines it beyond dispute. The proof that there is an *anastasis* of the dead alleged by our Saviour, is the declaration of God to Moses, I am the God of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob; and the irresistible truth, that God is not the God of the dead, but of the living. The consequence, as every one who reads the Bible knows, is that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, were living at the time this declaration was made. Those who die, therefore, live after they are dead; and this future life is the *anastasis*; which is proved by our Saviour in this passage, and which is universally denoted by this term throughout the *New Testament*. Nothing is more evident than that Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, had not risen from the dead, (as to their material bodies,) and that the declaration concerning them is no proof of the resurrection (of the body.) But it is certain they are living beings; and therefore this passage is a complete proof that mankind live after death.*

Doubtless, objections can be urged against the view we have taken of the text under consideration. It may be said, in the first place, that we have forced, if not totally misapplied the apostle's language, in making the word *all* mean the same as *whole*, and referring it to an individual, instead of using it as referring to individuals. In reply we have only to inquire, what other view can be taken of this text, which will not involve the whole subject which the

* As quoted by Bush, p. 148.

apostle undertook to explain, in difficulty and confusion? If the position be taken, that he designed to say the resurrection of the dead would not take place till the end of time, and that then, some or all of those who should be found living on the earth would be translated to heaven without dying — would he not plainly contradict what he had before said, even in this same chapter? In verse 22, he says, “For as in Adam all die, even so, in Christ shall all be made alive.” That is, as all who have borne the mortal constitution, which God conferred on Adam at his creation, must die, even so, shall all who thus die be made alive, or be raised in that spiritual constitution of which Christ is the representative. If all do not die as Adam died, then all will not be made alive in Christ; for, “that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die.” Or, if it be said, the apostle expected that the end of the natural world would take place, before he and some of those whom he addressed should die; then we answer, his expectations were certainly groundless, and he was mistaken in the thing whereof he affirmed. But, as we have already said, we neither admit that the apostle contradicted himself, or that he mistook in relation to the sentiments which he advanced. We should be unwilling to indulge such a supposition. There are others which, to our mind, are far less objectionable. It is admitted by many learned defenders of the proper inspiration of the Scriptures, that the sacred writers—the authors of the Epistles of the New Testament, for example—were not supernaturally directed in rela-

tion to the *precise language* they should employ, in communicating revealed truths ; (except in particular cases.) The Epistles are written in a serious but very familiar style.

Would it detract, then, from the admitted inspiration of the first Epistle to the Corinthians, to suppose that, by some means, the word *pantes*, in the fifty-first verse of the fifteenth chapter, has taken the place of *pante*? the variation of a mere syllable. And if we are not allowed to suppose that such a variation, from precisely what was intended, could follow the apostolic pen, may we not suppose his amanuensis, (for it seems that he employed one or more,) or the early copyists of this Letter, wrote *pantes* for *pante*, and that this trifling alteration in terminating a word has remained uncorrected, if not unperceived ; since the former word, *pantes*, made the text read more in favor of a common opinion of the church than the latter ? This supposition is the less objectionable, as it regards the apostle, as being consistent with himself in what he meant to communicate. Because, if instead of *pantes*, we use *pante*, in the text, it will read thus : “ Behold, I show you a mystery ; we shall not (*pante*) *wholly* die, (or sleep,) but we shall be *wholly* changed.” That is, the body will die and mingle with the dust ; but the spirit will not die, but it will be changed in its condition ; it will leave the natural body, to be clothed with the spiritual body. Hence, the apostle was truly inspired, though the phraseology of his writings is his own, account as we may, for the change of a letter or a

syllable, in the text in question. Our reverence for the Scriptures causes us to prefer the supposition, in this case, which leaves Paul uncontradicted by himself.*

In the second place, it may be said that this resurrection and change is to take place at the sound of the last trump, which in fact indicates that the event is yet future. The proper reply to this is, that the phrase "last trump" is "a symbolical figure, with which the notice of great changes and important events is often introduced in prophecy."† It is used here to denote the great and last event of man's earthly career, the great change which every individual must experience in passing from mortality to immortality.

In the third place, it may be said that the word sleep, as used by the apostle, and even Christ himself, seems to imply something more than the dissolution of the body. It seems to indicate that a sort of insensibility comes over the whole man, when he dies.

* We would suggest, that the word *pantes*, translated *all*, may, (as contended by some scholars,) if the connection in which it be found require it, be rendered the whole, and refer to a single individual, as well as all, and refer to individuals. There is an ancient reading found in Griesback's, and copied into Greenfield's Greek Testament, as follows: "*oi pantes men koim, oi pantes de allagesometha.*" According to this, the passage should read thus: The whole (*oi pantes*) of us shall not die, but the whole (*oi pantes*) of us shall be changed. One of the old poets has used the word and applied it to himself. He says, "I shall not all die;" by which he meant, that this body would die, but his spirit would not. By the same rule, the apostle might say, when addressing others, "We shall not all," every part of us, "sleep or die, but we shall all," every part of us, be changed.

† Ballou's Notes on the fifteenth chapter of Corinthians. *Uni. Review* for Apr., p. 166.

But I apprehend that it was from a deep feeling of truth that the apostle did not mention the name of death, but spoke of it as a soft sleep, a gentle and sure transition to a better life. And this should always continue to be the only idea and feeling of death, in the language and in the thoughts of Christians. Natural sleep may be considered, in a limited sense, as an emblem, as a daily symbol of death. In the natural sleep the external or bodily portion of man undergoes a sort of death, while the intelligent principle still lives within, and gains rest and refreshment during the repose of the body. And as without sleep we could not enjoy the coming light of the morrow; so without death we cannot enjoy that brighter morning which succeeds the grave.

As the fifty-first verse of this chapter is considered to be similar, in its import, to the following, we may as well introduce it here as any where.

I. THESSALONIANS 4: 13 — 18. But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them, also, which sleep in Jesus, will God bring with him. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive, and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first. Then we which are alive, and remain, shall be caught

up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words.

This is confessedly a difficult passage to explain ; but still I think it may be laid open, and the truth it embraces presented to the view. First, then, let it be noticed that the coming of the Lord spoken of in the text, had reference, doubtless, to Christ's coming in his kingdom, which was to take place not far from the time of Paul's writing his epistle to the Thessalonians. "For this we say unto you, by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not prevent them which are asleep." Where, in all the four Gospels, do we find a "word of the Lord," which authorises us to say that the Son of man is yet to appear upon this earth to effect a simultaneous resurrection ? I know of no such word. But we have a word in Matt. 24 : 30, 31, which says, "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven, with power and great glory ; and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together," &c. This coming was to take place within a few years after the death of Christ, before some of his disciples should die ; and it is the same coming spoken of in the text, as is evident from the context. I. Thess. 3 : 13, "To the end he may establish your hearts unblameable in holiness before God, even our Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ with all his saints." 5 : 1, 2, "But of

the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you: For yourselves know perfectly, that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night."

Second. Let it be noticed that by the word "sleep," and the phrase "sleep in Jesus," we are to understand natural death, and also that the dead in Christ, and those who were said to be sleeping in Jesus, were those who had died in the cause of Christ; who had suffered persecution for their faith, and who had, on account of Christ, exposed themselves to death. We might argue the truth of this from a number of considerations; but it will be sufficient to say that those, who died previous to Christ's appearance on earth, could not have been said to be dead in him, and that the Greek preposition *en*, may be rendered, *on account of*. The phrase would then read thus: *the dead on account of Christ*. Wakefield renders it thus: "*They who have died in the cause of Christ.*"

Third. Let it be remembered that an ill-founded notion prevailed to some extent among the Thessalonians, that all who died previous to the second coming of Christ, (which was then supposed by all Christians to be near at hand,) would be deprived almost entirely of the felicities of his kingdom and the benefit of his reign, and that, therefore, those who had suffered and died in the cause of Christ, had suffered in vain, having brought themselves to a premature death, from which they would never awake. Hence, those who had lost friends, in this way, mourned bitterly over

their sad fate ; and the apostle's object, in the text, was to correct these false notions, to comfort the sorrowful, and to show them that their friends, who had died in the cause of Christ, should be raised from the dead, and be as well off, as those who should live on the earth till the coming of Christ in his kingdom.

Fourth. Notice the phrase, "*them will God bring with him.*" What does it mean? Professor Bush speaks in relation to it as follows: "Does it imply that when our Lord *descends* from heaven with predicted pomp and glory, he will be attended by an accompaniment of saints who had formerly slept in him? If so, the following is perhaps the view which is to be deduced from the apostle's language: When the Lord comes at this crisis, he shall *bring with him* his saints who have slept in him. But here an objection would occur. How can they come with him, unless previously they were with him? And how can they be with him unless they shall first have risen for that purpose? And how can they have risen without having undergone a resurrection? And how can they have been the subjects of this resurrection, if they are yet reposing in the dust? This natural query the apostle proceeds to obviate in the sentence that follows: "The dead in Christ (i. e., those that have slept in him) shall rise first," i. e., shall rise or shall have arisen, *previous'y*. That this is the probable sense of *proton proteron*, in this connection, may be shown by an appeal to the *usus loquendi* in the following passages: Matt. 5: 24, "Leave there thy gift before the altar and go thy way, *first* (*proton, previously*)

be reconciled to thy brother," &c. Matt. 12 : 29, "How can one enter into a strong man's house and spoil his goods, except he *first (proton, previously)* bind the strong man?" Mark 9 : 11, 12, "Why say the Scribes that Elias must *first (proton, previously)* come? And he answered and told them, Elias verily cometh *first (proton, previously)* and restor-eth all things." II. Thes. 2 : 3, "For that day shall not come, except there come a falling away *first.*" (*proton, previously.*) I. Tim. 3 : 10, "And let these also *first (proton, previously)* be proved." The evidence, therefore, may be considered strong, that this is the true sense of the term in this connection, and the clause, being thrown in for the purpose of meeting a tacit objection, ought to have been enclosed in a parenthesis. The whole passage will then read thus: "For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, with the trump of God (and the dead in Christ shall have previously arisen;) then we which are alive and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds (*in clouds*, i. e. in multitudes, as the article is wanting,) to meet the Lord in the air." The phrase, *shall be caught up together with them*, means not on this view so properly that *we shall be caught up in company with them* — for how could *they* be caught up when they were already descending with Christ from heaven? — but simply, we shall be caught up (when we die) *to be with them.*"

This view to me seems correct; it places the im-

port of the apostle's language plainly before my mind. It makes him say, "I would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning the condition and prospects of those who are asleep in Jesus, or those of your friends who have suffered persecution unto death, because of faith in him. I would not have you sorrow for your friends who have departed this life, as the heathen do, who have no hope of a future life ; for if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, we may be assured that those who sleep in Jesus will God bring with him when he comes in his kingdom, and they shall occupy their proper places in his spiritual realm. For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord, shall not go before, nor have any advantage over those who are asleep. For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God, and the dead, by or through Christ, having previously arisen, therefore we in our turn, (when we die) shall be raised up to meet Christ together with them in the great congregation in the heavens ; and so shall we ever be with the Lord. Wherefore comfort one another with these words."

Should any one be disposed to ask, in what sense did God bring those, who had suffered and died in the cause of Christ, with him when he came in his kingdom ? I answer, that they came as Christ came, spiritually. He is the sovereign of the Gospel kingdom. They are subordinate rulers under him. He

reigns spiritually, so do they. His throne is spiritual, so are theirs; for they were to have thrones. See Matt. 19: 28, and Luke 22: 30; also the remarks on II. Timothy 6: 5—8.

Now, we appeal to our candid readers, whether the above interpretation of the very difficult passage in question, does not commend itself to their understandings and hearts, from the fact, that it is reasonable, and rescues the text from that labyrinth of inconsistencies, and contradictions of the known laws of nature, in which it is involved by expositors generally? We are confident that the more carefully and patiently this view of the subject is examined, the less objectionable it will appear. May we, therefore, solicit an unprejudiced and dispassionate re-perusal, if any doubts obtrude themselves upon any readers, sincerely desirous of believing the whole truth?

CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION.

As we have taken the position, and as we think, sustained it, that we are to understand the phrase, resurrection of the dead, as implying the future life of those who die, without any regard to the process by which it is attained, and that death, of itself, works no moral change in individual character, it may be asked, how we can believe in the final holiness and happiness of all men, since it is an admitted fact that sin and misery are inseparably connected, and that so many die in a state of unreconciliation and sin. I reply, that my faith in this glorious doctrine rests upon the promises of God, which embrace the mission of Christ, who revealed his character as being infinite in goodness.

The apostle Peter commences the first chapter of his second epistle with a salutation, indicating the relationship existing between him and those whom he addressed ; and then suddenly proceeds to state, for their consideration, great and important doctrines. He says, "Grace and peace be multiplied unto you, through the knowledge of God, and of Jesus our Lord, according as his divine power hath given unto us all things that appertain unto life and godliness,

through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue: Whereby are given unto us exceeding great and precious promises; that by these ye might be partakers of the divine nature." Here are two particulars plainly taught, viz: that a knowledge of God, impressed upon the mind by the teaching of Christ, gives or opens to us exceeding great and precious promises, and that by these we are made partakers of the divine nature. Let us take up these two facts in order, and elaborate them as thoroughly as we are able in the space which we are permitted to occupy.

The desire for happiness has universally prevailed among men. Disappointment has in no case destroyed it, but rather given it edge. However dark the fortunes of to-day, we desire that to-morrow may be more propitious, and that brighter scenes of felicity may be continually opening before us. Desire is never satisfied with present good. More is demanded. It ever stretches upward to higher attainments. It passes the misty bounds of time and eagerly searches for happiness in the dark profounds of eternity. It wants to know, when this mingled lot of joy and sorrow is passed, what shall be after it. Man always desires that both time and eternity may yield him happiness. This same desire lived anciently, in those olden times, when men carved out with their own hands the gods they worshipped. Many cries went up from anxious souls for information in relation to their destiny, but no certain answer was returned, — no satisfaction was given.

Many called loudly upon the gods to tell them whether their desire for eternal felicity should be gratified, but the answer was confused, indirect, and perplexing. In this dark period, when the agony of disappointment was fast settling down upon the souls of men, a voice rang out clear and loud from the hills and valleys of Judea, virtually saying to the world of mankind, your desire for happiness shall be granted. Yes, Christ said by the principles he revealed, it is provided for in the counsels of heaven. The great Author of universal being has so designed it. Its bestowment is the great object of his creative work. It is the sum of all his promises. And every mind that realizes the power of these words, acknowledges that it has received exceeding great and precious promises. And every one that knows God, as he is revealed by Jesus Christ, feels these promises to be true and sure, as well as precious; for by him He is shown to be infinite in goodness; and what object could unmingled goodness have in the creation of mankind but to confer upon them the greatest possible happiness! No other object than this can be attributed to Deity, if Christ has revealed the truth in relation to his character. And what God hath purposed cannot fail. Therefore, as men become acquainted with Him through the medium of Jesus, they learn that their most ardent desire for happiness shall be gratified; and thus is communicated to them exceeding great and precious promises. Nothing in the universe can be more precious to man than such promises; for they are the sum of all his desires.

They are great enough and good enough to answer every wish.

We are now to notice the fact, that, by these promises, we are made partakers of the divine nature. But the question to be settled is, How? It may be answered, that man has always been diligent in searching out means to gratify his desire for happiness; he has tried almost every thing but the right, and in most cases sought for joy where it was not to be found. He has imagined its true source to be in those things which minister to his bodily appetites and the cravings of his animal nature. For these he has toiled, and exhausted his powers of body, and severely taxed his intellectual energies. But sensual gratifications have afforded only momentary pleasures; they have never yielded pure and lasting happiness; on the contrary they have often been converted into engines of unspeakable misery. It is the mind alone that contains the germs of immortal felicity. The soul alone contains the elements of pure and ever enduring happiness. Therefore, to purify and elevate man's moral and intellectual nature is to open within him mines of unceasing joy. This is in accordance with all the teachings of Christ; and man only needs to realize it, to be induced to strive for the happiness which flows from a heaven-imbued spirit. Show a man where happiness may positively be found, and he will search there for it. Make him feel that it is in moral and intellectual excellence, and he will strive with all his powers to mount up to them.

Christ came into the world, not only to demonstrate the ultimate happiness of man, but to show what will constitute it. He not only gave great and precious promises, but he showed that all true happiness does now and ever will depend upon the development and elevation of that spiritual nature which man possesses, and which constitutes him a child of God. He showed that heaven's joy does not consist of outward grandeur, or music, or sensuality. But the happiness which will be enjoyed in the Paradise of God, and of which we may partake here, is the happiness which God himself has in the elements of his own nature. He is happy because of the moral and intellectual perfections of his character. Hence the joy of heaven is, mainly and substantially, a moral and a spiritual joy; and if the greatest happiness lie in the enjoyment of what we most love, then the best definition that can be given of the happiness of immortality is, that it consists in the enjoyment of moral and intellectual excellence, by those whose nature it is supremely to love such excellence. To them the most sweet, harmonious music is that which rises up in the soul, as holiness and truth go vibrating through it; and to them the most glorious of all splendor is that splendid righteousness with which, among the angels and saints and hosts of the redeemed, they are every where encircled. This is happiness indeed; it is the happiness of heaven, and in fact it is all the real and lasting happiness there is promised in this or any other world; it is the same kind of happiness

which God enjoys in the supreme, moral, and intellectual perfections of his nature. And the more man is made to realize this, the more will he strive for the happiness of a soul pervaded by truth and holiness. And he shall not strive in vain; "for he that seeks shall find, and to him that knocks it shall be opened." Such shall find truth, such shall find holiness, and as they find these they find God — they are made partakers of the divine nature.

Thus it is, that a knowledge of God, through Jesus Christ, has given unto us great and precious promises, and that by these we are made partakers of the divine nature, and introduced into the heavenly state, being changed in the spirit of our minds so that we are induced to forsake the evil and pursue the good. Now, though death in itself has no power to work this moral change, — yet a change of circumstances and condition, a keener perception of the beatitude which truth and love confer upon their votaries, and their increased power of operation in the government of God, will induce every individual of the human family to strive more and more to become assimilated to the perfections of the Divine nature.

It is admitted, I believe, by all, that when an individual enters upon the Future Life, his spiritual eyes are opened to see the enormity of sin, and the exceeding glory of holiness, and that the moral light, which radiates from the throne of the Eternal, will pour upon him in such overwhelming floods, as to preclude the possibility of his mistaking the right,

and the nature of it. Justice, and mercy, and truth and power will stand before the soul, blended in perfect harmony ; and many say, it will be overwhelmed by a sense of the perfections of the Divine character and of its own guilt and condemnation. In this state it will feel the keenest anguish. It must know then, what will positively minister to its happiness or misery ; and if it is left to choose freely between them, we know that it will as certainly choose the good, as we know that a sane man will not put his hand willingly into the fire, or drink deadly poison. And to say that God will force him to choose the evil, is to suggest what is too monstrous to be entertained for a moment in these days of gospel light. And if he does choose the right and pursue it, if there is any truth in the Bible, his former iniquity shall be blotted out of God's book, and be remembered no more against him. And to say, that the remembrance of sin, which had been repented of and forgiven, brings misery to the soul, is what our entire experience contradicts. That the individual will be inclined to follow the dictates of truth and righteousness, is evident from the fact that flesh and blood will not go into the immortal world. The body, with all its passions, senses and desires, will go and mingle with the dust from whence it came ; and as nearly all unrighteous desires, and temptations to gross wickedness, come to the mind through the agency of the body — its senses and appetites—the soul will be delivered from most of its enticements to evil when it passes the bounds of death. For

example, the man addicted to the sin of intemperance will not in the Future Life have a thirst for the intoxicating bowl. Then, the curse of that sin will not be found there. Neither money nor the need of it will be there, so that the great multitude of evils, of which the love of it is the cause, will not exist there. The same may be said of all that variety of sins, which spring from the desires, passions, and imperfections of man's carnal nature. The soul, disencumbered from all these, and clothed upon with its spiritual body, is prepared to go on to perfection. That it will do so, must be evident to all who consider what was the object of Christ's mission into the world, and what were the principles which lay at the foundation of his doctrine, and the motives and impulses of all his actions.

The entire object of Christ's mission into the world, according to the New Testament, was to save sinners; and as the sum and substance of the Christian religion is but the revelation and embodiment of the will and love of God, the conclusion is legitimate that it was to save all sinners. "In this," saith the apostle, "was manifested the love of God towards us, because that God sent his only begotten Son into the world that we might live through him. Herein is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us, and sent his Son to be the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the sins of the whole world." I. John 4: 9—12. According to this apostle, God in love hath purposed a work as extensive as the creation of man; for "the Father

sent the Son to be the Saviour of the world." (John 4: 14.) Thus the whole Christian system is but an exhibition of the Divine will and love, blended in a body of harmonious proportions. These two principles, the love and will of God, pervade it, and give life and energy to all its operations; they are so manifest in all the economy of the gospel as to show us that "God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself." The gospel also exhibits the fact that in this work of reconciliation, God and Christ are one; one in purpose and spirit. The testimony, which the character, teachings, and death of Christ bear to this point, is thrilling and irrefragable. And if the spirit which he manifested is found in his followers to any considerable extent, to that extent are they made one with him and God, and to that same extent do they desire to overcome evil with good and to deliver their fellows from sin and misery. To live in unison with the spirit of God and Christ, we are required to love all whom they love, and to strive to do them good and not evil. "Love your enemies, bless them that curse you, do good to them that hate you, and pray for them that despitefully use you and persecute you; that ye may be the children of your Father which is in heaven." To do this is to be born again, — to be characteristically a child of God — to be under the influence of Christianity — to be guided by the spirit of God and Christ — to be joined with them in one work, one spirit, and one purpose. The essence of Christianity, then, is unbounded benevolence; it is an exhibition of unmin-

gled love, proceeding with Almighty energy from Jehovah, through Jesus Christ, to a sinful world, descending to the most degraded, embracing the vilest sinner in its purposes and operations. Such is the central and all prevading principle of the "glorious Gospel of the blessed God."

This principle has but one end and aim, and that is, the good of all within the sphere of its operations; and it is very obvious that it can never do its appropriate work without resulting in the salvation of all men. This is the object of all its efforts; for this it strives and ever will strive so long as it has an existence. Universal love must ever seek universal good. And it is a fact worthy of all consideration, that the men, who have drunk deepest into the pure spirit of Christian love, have been the least disposed to war against the doctrine of universal salvation; and having a strong desire that it may prove true, they are inclined to believe it. Just in proportion as the principles of the Gospel, as we have presented them, are impressed upon their hearts, will they desire that all sin and suffering may cease, and that peace and grace may reign triumphant throughout God's intelligent creation. Such men are always instinctively drawn towards faith in a result so desirable, and they are never disposed to oppose with bitterness those who advocate the truth of it. Thus it must ever be. Neither education, nor circumstances, nor prejudices, can prevent the heart, which is thoroughly imbued with the love every where conspicuous in the New Testament, from embracing

the sentiments of Universalism. If preconceived opinions and deep-rooted habits of thought come up to oppose, and adduce the sinfulness of man as an objection to this doctrine, reason will reply that his sinfulness did not so destroy God's love as to prevent him from sending Christ into the world to save the sinner from his sins. If it be suggested that He can never accomplish this because of man's free agency, reason again replies that man always acts from motives, good or bad; and that the nearest apparent good always proves to be the strongest motive, and therefore governs his choice. Now Christianity claims to be that rich inheritance which all desire—that panacea which every sinner needs, to heal his moral wounds, and restore his disordered soul to healthful activity—that spiritual good which will bring him into harmony with the divine requirements, and give him that rest and peace which the disobedient never feel. Besides, the human mind will never rest satisfied with the idea that man's free agency will defeat the purposes of the Omnipotent Governor of all things. He gave man all the agency he possesses; and it is not in accordance with common sense, to suppose that he would bestow upon a creature powers which he could not control, and then attempt to control them through the agency of Jesus Christ. If we now turn to the nice distinctions which are sometimes made between the love of complacency and other kinds of love, and thence assume that the love of God and Christ, and of just men made perfect, is only a passive sort of benevolence, which induces them to do nothing more than

to offer salvation to the sinner, which only has power to make them willing he should be saved, facts stand in direct opposition to our assumptions; for had God been indifferent about man's salvation, He would never have sent Christ to perform such a work; and it would never have been said by an inspired apostle, that "God so loved the world that He sent His only begotten Son, that we might live through him." It was not a spirit of quietism or inactivity that devised the plan of salvation, and sent Christ to execute it. Such a spirit never induced his followers to spend their lives and best treasures in the work of human improvement. All this has been accomplished through the influence of deep, strong, active benevolence. This spirit guides the councils of God, was the moving power of Christ's efforts, and has led all good men in their toils for the elevation of degraded humanity. If it be said that the demands of the justice of Deity must be considered in this connection, and not sacrificed to His love, it may be replied that the demands of justice do not conflict with those of mercy. "God is love." Love is his nature, and it must not be said that he has any attributes which are at war with His nature. Hence, love as much directs the rod of judgment, as the dispensation of mercy; and no inflictions will ever be suffered by man that are not consistent with the most unbounded benevolence. And as God is immutable, his love can never change; it will ever be the same active principle, it will always seek the good of its objects. He loved man

(generic man) when he gave him existence, not because of any good which man had done, but because love was the essential principle of his own nature ; and as his nature never changes, he ever will love him in time and eternity, with all the intensity and ardor that he did when he formed the plan of salvation, or sent angels to herald the Messenger of the New Covenant into the world. Jesus Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever ; his love towards man is the same, and he will ever seek his salvation with as much solicitude as when "He gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time ;" for "He must see of the travail of his soul and be satisfied." It must be so, or else God and Christ must change, and the fundamental principles of the Gospel pass away as the vapor before the rising sun. Should this ever occur, the moral government of God would be dissolved, and the requirements and obligations of Christianity proved abortive, and the whole Gospel system be but a fleeting shadow, without any foundation in the nature of things. No supposition, however, can be more absurd than this. But we forbear ; enough has already been said to prove that the essential principles of Christianity, as presented in the New Testament, can never accomplish their object without bringing every soul into harmony with the divine government ; or, which is the same thing, saving them with an everlasting salvation. This fact is such as the fundamental principles of the gospel must work out, if allowed to have their full and legitimate operations.

A question, of no small importance, may here present itself, and call for especial attention. It may be enquired whether our conduct in this life will not have an influence upon our future life ; and whether there will not be different degrees of happiness there, on account of the different ways in which men have improved or misimproved their privileges here. Nothing has yet been advanced contradicting this statement, and, doubtless, much can be said in favor of it. There is no danger, at least, in taking the position, that as is the measure of improvement or moral and mental culture, so is the measure of true and permanent happiness, and always will be through all the stages of our existence. We repeat, then, no pure and lasting felicity can spring from sensualism ; on the contrary, all pure and permanent joy is the inheritance of that soul, which lives and advances in the divine life. Pamper the body as much as you may, only momentary sensations will be experienced. Draw upon all its sources of pleasure and you will find them short-lived and unsatisfying ; and if you tax them to a certain extent, they cease to yield pleasure ; tax them beyond this and they will become sources of excruciating misery. But the happiness which rises up in a soul so exercised by truth and love, as to be continually advancing to a higher spiritual life, never grows dull, nor changes to pain. Now, with the fact in view that only that individual, who develops by cultivation his spiritual powers, enjoys pure and lasting happiness, it is easy to be seen that a person might so neglect these

powers as to be incapable of any happiness, save that transitory pleasure which is the result of pampering the appetites and passions of the body. Now divest such of their bodies, give them spiritual bodies, and usher them into an existence where no sensual gratification or pleasure can ever be experienced, and how much positive happiness are they capable of enjoying? But very little, though they may have determined to abandon the wrong and pursue the right. It is one thing to be saved from sin, and another, and quite a different thing, to be capable of a high degree of happiness through moral and intellectual culture. Freedom from sin and misery does not confer positive happiness. An insect may be guilty of no moral wrong, and consequently suffer no pain, yet be susceptible of no happiness, save what arises from the exercise of his physical powers. Here is an infant, and a man whose spiritual nature is well developed. Does any one suppose that the enjoyment of the child is equal to that of the man? By no means. Why, then, should it be supposed that their enjoyment will be equal in the future world? As flesh and blood, or the body, cannot inherit the kingdom of God — cannot go into the immortal world, all happiness must of course be of a spiritual nature; and it follows as a natural consequence that he, who has elevated and expanded his spiritual powers the most, will be the happiest. In this world, two individuals may be delivered from the impediments and obstacles which lay in the pathway of improvement, at the same time, and yet

not be equal in their attainments, and consequently not be equally susceptible of enjoyment, though neither of them are subjects of pain. The one has employed every means within his reach to advance in the divine life, and even turned the obstacles he has had to encounter into instruments of moral husbandry, while the other has neglected all means of improvement, and, of course, he cannot receive the inheritance of him who has labored. So two individuals, of equal advantages in this life, may enter upon the future life at the same time, and at the same time be delivered from all checks and hindrances to improvement, yet their progress in the divine life may have been very unequal, hence their happiness must be unequal. It may be said, in reply to this, that the condition of all will be made equal, the moment they enter upon the resurrection state. Where is the evidence of it? Certainly it is not to be found in reason or Scripture. But suppose it to be true. How shall it be accomplished? Shall the infant, the idiot, the ignorant and degraded, be suddenly advanced to the condition of those whose moral and intellectual powers have been largely developed by cultivation? Or shall the latter be brought down to a level with the former? In either case, there is no proof that this equality will continue very long; unless it be proved that the condition of every individual will be fixed for eternity, and the law of progress suspended or repealed; for, allow them their several capacities for improvement, and there is no telling what inequalities there may be in their advancement, even under the

same circumstances and government ; for there is no knowing what disabilities sin may have imposed upon the law of progress. If it be said that all will be made equal and fixed in one condition, without the power to retrograde or advance, it may be replied that man is an active being ; his mind was never made to be wholly at rest, or confined within one circle of thoughts and ideas. It must be permitted to range upward and onward without bound or limit, or it will sicken and become the centre of disease and misery, as would the body were it deprived of exercise and fresh air. The soul was not constituted to be happy in confinement, though surrounded by all the outward grandeur and splendor of the universe. Liberty and progress are its elements — cut off from these, it is discontented and miserable. Its life and joy consists in striving to rise higher and higher in those perfections which belong to the Divine Nature. This is what Christ meant when he said, “ Be ye perfect even as your Father in Heaven is perfect.” Human perfection consists in the free and harmonious unfolding and exercise of all our faculties. This is the supreme command of duty ; and virtue, the performance of duty, is nothing else than the most earnest striving after perfection. The faculties of the body, of the mind, of the intellect, the affections, and the active powers of man, require constant and strenuous exercise, without which there is no health nor growth, either for the body or the mind. With these facts in view, it is absurd to talk about a Heaven of happiness, where there is neither progress nor activity for

the soul, nor means of adding to its stock of divine wisdom.

Casting our eyes back over the course we have pursued in this chapter, we readily perceive that this life has a purpose — that God placed us in this world for a higher object than to minister wholly to the passions and appetites of the body. God has bestowed upon us powers and faculties, which are to survive the dissolution of the body, which contain in themselves the elements of all the true happiness we now or ever shall enjoy, which will yield their fruits only through development and cultivation ; and the cultivation of which is left in our own hands. God does not do for us what we can do for ourselves. He has given us the sun, and the rain, and the prolific soil, but he does not plough, nor sow, nor reap. This work he left for us to do ; and we must do it or starve. And He has given us the seed, the rich and nourishing earth, sends down upon it the fertilizing dews and showers of heaven, and sheds upon it the warmth of the life-giving sun, that we may plant and cultivate, and in time of harvest reap an abundance for our physical support and comfort ; so has he made the human soul but little lower than the angelic spirits, and placed it in this state of trial and discipline, and surrounded it by many objects to call forth all its powers and capacities, and shed upon it the light of revelation, that as a soul, an intelligent and immortal spirit, it might grow continually in moral and intellectual excellence. The great object of our life, then, is to educate our souls, to develop those powers of mind which ally us

to God and Jesus Christ, to angels and just men made perfect; therefore we should employ life and all things belonging to it, in making ourselves wiser and better. For this most glorious of all purposes, did God place us in this rudiment state. If we disregard this purpose we do it to our own injury. We must also cherish the virtues of the Gospel, till their practice becomes delightful and heaven-inspiring. Constant prayer must be made, that the mental vision may be kept clear to descry the most distant of her graces, and that the soul may be constantly exercised with an unfeigned love of them. We must persevere in seeking till we find, and in asking till we receive, and in knocking till it is opened unto us. The acquirement may now appear obscure and distant; yet if we commence with an inflexible, determined spirit, storing up in our souls the humble elements of Christian excellence, and constantly press towards a higher life, we shall rise from joy to joy, finding fresh and crystal fountains of celestial glory as we go; and drinking deeper and deeper into the Divine Nature, find a confirmation of the declaration that God is a rewarder of all such as diligently search for him; and be enabled to say truly, that the Spirit of God witnesseth with our spirits that we are indeed his children; and hereby know we, that we are in him, even by the spirit which he has given us.



.


~~JUN 1 1987~~

~~FEB 28 1987~~

~~DEC 25 1989~~

Acme

Bookbinding Co., Inc.
300 Summer Street
Boston, Mass. 02210



3 2044 054 119 201

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
HARRIS, Jerome							Call Number	
AUTHOR The futrue life							BT	
TITLE							931	
							.H3	

